arXiv:1606.04360v2 [math.PR] 7 Feb 2017

STOCHASTIC HAMILTONIAN FLOWS WITH SINGULAR COEFFICIENTS

XICHENG ZHANG

Dedicated to the 60th birthday of Professor Michael Röckner

Abstract. In this paper we study the following stochastic Hamiltonian system in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ (a second order stochastic differential equation),

$$\mathrm{d}\dot{X}_t = b(X_t, \dot{X}_t)\mathrm{d}t + \sigma(X_t, \dot{X}_t)\mathrm{d}W_t, \ \ (X_0, \dot{X}_0) = (x, \mathrm{v}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d},$$

where $b(x, \mathrm{v}) : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\sigma(x, \mathrm{v}) : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$ are two Borel measurable functions. We show that if σ is bounded and uniformly non-degenerate, and $b \in H^{2/3,0}_p$ and $\nabla\sigma \in L^p$ for some $p > 2(2d+1)$, where $H^{\alpha,\beta}_p$ is the Bessel potential space with differentiability indices α in x and β in v, then the above stochastic equation admits a unique strong solution so that $(x, \mathrm{v}) \mapsto Z_t(x, \mathrm{v}) := (X_t, \dot{X}_t)(x, \mathrm{v})$ forms a stochastic homeomorphism flow, and $(x, \mathrm{v}) \mapsto Z_t(x, \mathrm{v})$ is weakly differentiable with $\mathrm{ess.sup}_{x,\mathrm{v}} \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} |\nabla Z_t(x, \mathrm{v})|^q\right) < \infty$ for all $q \geqslant 1$ and $T \geqslant 0$. Moreover, we also show the uniqueness of probability measure-valued solutions for kinetic Fokker-Planck equations with rough coefficients by showing the well-posedness of the associated martingale problem and using the superposition principle established by Figalli [14] and Trevisan [33].

1. Introduction

Consider the following *second order* time dependent stochastic differential equation (abbreviated as SDE):

$$\mathrm{d}\dot{X}_t = b_t(X_t, \dot{X}_t)\mathrm{d}t + \sigma_t(X_t, \dot{X}_t)\mathrm{d}W_t, \ \ (X_0, \dot{X}_0) = (x, \mathrm{v}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d},$$

where $b_t(x, \mathrm{v}) : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\sigma_t(x, \mathrm{v}) : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$ are two Borel measurable functions, $\dot{X}_t$ denotes the first order derivative of X_t with respect to t, and W_t is a d-dimensional standard Brownian motion on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mathbb{P})$. When $\sigma = 0$, the above equation is the classical Newtonian mechanic equation, which describes the motion of a particle. When $\sigma \neq 0$, it means that the motion is perturbed by some random external force. More backgrounds about the above stochastic Hamiltonian system are referred to [29, 32], etc.

Key words and phrases. Stochastic Hamiltonian system, Weak differentiability, Krylov's estimate, Zvonkin's transformation, Kinetic Fokker-Planck operator.

This work is supported by NNSFs of China (Nos. 11271294, 11325105).

It is noticed that if we let $Z_t := (X_t, \dot{X}_t)$, then Z_t solves the following *one order* (degenerate) SDE:

$$\mathrm{d}Z_t = (\dot{X}_t, b_t(Z_t))\mathrm{d}t + (0, \sigma_t(Z_t)\mathrm{d}W_t), \;\; Z_0 = z = (x, \mathrm{v}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}, \tag{1.1}$$

and whose time-dependent infinitesimal generator is given by

$$\mathscr{L}_t^{a,b} f(x, \mathrm{v}) := \mathrm{tr}(a_t \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 f)(x, \mathrm{v}) + (\mathrm{v} \cdot \nabla_x f)(x, \mathrm{v}) + (b_t \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}} f)(x, \mathrm{v}). \tag{1.2}$$

Here $a_t(x, \mathrm{v}) := \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_t \sigma_t^*)(x, \mathrm{v})$, $\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 f(x, \mathrm{v})$ stands for the Hessian matrix, the asterisk and $\mathrm{tr}(\cdot)$ denote the transpose and the trace of a matrix respectively. Moreover, let μ_t be the probability distributional measure of Z_t in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$. By Itô's formula, one knows that μ_t solves the following Fokker-Planck equation in the distributional sense:

$$\partial_t \mu_t = (\mathscr{L}_t^{a,b})^* \mu_t, \;\; \mu_0 = \delta_z, \tag{1.3}$$

where δ_z is the Dirac measure at z. More precisely, for any $f \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$,

$$\partial_t \mu_t(f) = \mu_t(\mathscr{L}_t^{a,b} f), \; \mu_0(f) = f(z),$$

where $\mu_t(f) = \int f \mathrm{d}\mu_t = \mathbb{E} f(Z_t)$. In the literature $\mathscr{L}_t^{a,b}$ is also called kinetic Fokker-Planck or Kolmogorov's operator.

During the past decade, there is an increasing interest in the study of SDEs with singular or rough coefficients. In the non-degenerate case, Krylov and Röckner [21] showed the strong uniqueness to the following SDE in $\mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\mathrm{d}X_t = b_t(X_t)\mathrm{d}t + \mathrm{d}W_t, \; X_0 = x,$$

where $b \in L^q_{lock}(\mathbb{R}^+; L^p(\mathbb{R}^d))$ with $\frac{d}{p} + \frac{2}{q} < 1$. The argument in [21] is based on Girsanov's theorem and some estimates from the theory of PDE. In this framework, Fedrizzi and Flandoli [12, 11] studied the well-posedness of stochastic transport equations with rough coefficients. When b is bounded measurable, the Malliavin differentiability of X_t with respect to sample path ω and the weak differentiability of X_t with respect to starting point x were recently studied in [23] and [25] respectively. We also mention that weak uniqueness was studied in [1] and [17] under rather weak assumptions on b (belonging to some Kato's class). Moreover, the multiplicative noise case was studied in [38, 39, 41] by using Zvonkin's transformation [42] and some careful estimates of second order parabolic equations.

In the degenerate case, Chaudru de Raynal [7] firstly showed the strong well-posedness for SDE (1.1) under the assumptions that σ is Lipschitz continuous and b is α-Hölder continuous in x and β-Hölder continuous in v with $\alpha \in (\frac{2}{3}, 1)$ and $\beta \in (0, 1)$. The proofs in [7] strongly depend on some explicit estimates for Kolmogorov operator with constant coefficients and Zvonkin's transformation. In a recent joint work [36] with F.Y. Wang, we also showed the strong uniqueness and homeomorphism property for (1.1) under weaker Hölder-Dini's continuity assumption on b. The proofs in [36] rely on a characterization of Hölder-Dini's spaces and gradient estimates for

the semigroup associated with the kinetic operator. Notice that in [7] and [36], more general degenerate SDEs are considered, while, the case with critical differentiability indices $\alpha = \frac{2}{3}$ and $\beta = 0$ is left open.

The purpose of this work is to establish a similar theory for degenerate SDE (1.1) as in Krylov and Röckner's paper [21] (see also [41]). In particular, the critical indices $\alpha = \frac{2}{3}$ and $\beta = 0$ are covered. More precisely, we aim to prove that

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that for some $K \geqslant 1$ and all $(t, x, \mathrm{v}) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}$,*

$$K^{-1}|\xi| \leqslant |\sigma_t^*(x, \mathrm{v})\xi| \leqslant K|\xi|, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{UE}$$

where σ^* denotes the transpose of matrix σ, and for some $p > 2(2d+1)$,

$$\kappa_0 := \sup_{s \geqslant 0} \|\nabla \sigma_s\|_p^p + \int_0^\infty \|(\mathbb{I} - \Delta_x)^{\frac{1}{3}} b_s\|_p^p \mathrm{d}s < \infty.$$

Then for any $z = (x, \mathrm{v}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, SDE (1.1) admits a unique strong solution $Z_t(z) = (X_t, \dot{X}_t)$ so that $(t, z) \mapsto Z_t(z)$ has a bi-continuous version. Moreover,

- **(A)** *There is a null set N such that for all $\omega \notin N$ and for each $t \geqslant 0$, the map $z \mapsto Z_t(z, \omega)$ is a homeomorphism on $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$.*
- **(B)** *For each $t \geqslant 0$, the map $z \mapsto Z_t(z)$ is weakly differentiable a.s., and for any $q \geqslant 1$ and $T > 0$,*

$$\operatorname{ess.sup}_z \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{t \in [0,T]} |\nabla Z_t(z)|^q \right) < \infty, \tag{1.4}$$

  where ∇ denotes the generalized gradient.
- **(C)** *Let σ^n and b^n be the regularized approximations of σ and b (see (5.2) below for definitions). Let Z^n be the corresponding solution of SDE (1.1) associated with (σ^n, b^n). For any $q \geqslant 1$ and $T > 0$, there exits a constant $C > 0$ only depending on T, K, κ_0, d, p, q such that*

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{t \in [0,T]} |Z_t^n - Z_t|^q \right) \leqslant C \left(\|b^n - b\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)}^q + n^{(\frac{2d}{p} - 1)q} \right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

As a corollary, we have the following local well-posedness result by a standard localization argument.

Corollary 1.2. *Suppose that for any $T, R > 0$, there exists a constant $K_{T,R} \geqslant 1$ such that for all $(t, x, \mathrm{v}) \in [0, T] \times B_R$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$K_{T,R}^{-1}|\xi| \leqslant |\sigma_t^*(x, \mathrm{v})\xi| \leqslant K_{T,R}|\xi|, \tag{1.5}$$

where $B_R := \{(x, \mathrm{v}) : |(x, \mathrm{v})| \leqslant R\}$, and for some $p > 2(2d+1)$,

$$\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|\nabla(\sigma_t \chi_R)\|_p^p + \int_0^T \|(\mathbb{I} - \Delta_x)^{\frac{1}{3}} (b_s \chi_R)\|_p^p \mathrm{d}s \leqslant K_{T,R},$$

where $\chi_R : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to [0,1]$ is a smooth function with $\chi_R(z) = 1$ for $|z| \leqslant R$ and $\chi_R(z) = 0$ for $|z| > 2R$. Then for any fixed $(x, \mathrm{v}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, SDE (1.1) admits a unique local strong solution $(X_t, \dot{X}_t)$ up to the explosion time ζ.

Proof. Let

$$\sigma_t^R(z) := \sigma_t(z\chi_R(z)), \quad b_t^R(z) := b_t(z)\chi_R(z).$$

By the assumptions, one sees that (σ^R, b^R) satisfies the conditions of Theorem 1.1. Hence, there exists a unique solution to the following SDE:

$$\mathrm{d}Z_t^R = (\dot{X}_t^R, b_t^R(Z_t^R))\mathrm{d}t + (0, \sigma_t^R(Z_t^R)\mathrm{d}W_t), \quad Z_0^R = z = (x, \mathrm{v}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d},$$

where $Z_t^R = (X_t^R, \dot{X}_t^R)$. Define

$$\zeta_R := \inf\left\{t \geqslant 0 : |Z_t^R| \geqslant R\right\}, \quad Z_t := Z_t^R, \ t \in [0, \zeta_R].$$

Since $Z_t^{R'}|_{[0,\zeta_R]} = Z_t^R|_{[0,\zeta_R]}$ for $R' > R$, one sees that $R \mapsto \zeta_R$ is increasing and the above Z_t is well-defined. Clearly, $\zeta = \lim_{R\to\infty} \zeta_R$ is the explosion time of Z_t, and Z_t uniquely solves (1.1) before ζ. □

The strategy of proving Theorem 1.1 is still based on Zvonkin's transformation. As in the non-degenerate case [41], we need to establish the L^p-maximal regularity estimate to the following degenerate parabolic equation (see Theorem 3.2 below):

$$\partial_t u = \mathscr{L}_t^{a,b} u + f, \quad u_0 = 0.$$

Here we shall use the freezing coefficient argument and the L^p-estimate established in [6] and [5] for degenerate operators with constant coefficients (see also [8] for the case of nonlocal operators). Compared with [6] and [27], we not only consider the optimal regularity of u along the nondegenerate v-direction, but also the optimal regularity of u along the degenerate x-direction.

On the other hand, from the viewpoint of PDE, the well-posedness of Fokker-Planck equation (1.3) (especially uniqueness) with rough coefficients is a quite involved problem. Since a and b possess less regularities and $\mathscr{L}_t^{a,b}$ is a degenerate operator, the direct analytical approach seems not work (cf. [3, 4]). Let $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ be the set of all probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$. We shall use a probabilistic method to prove the following result.

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose that σ satisfies* **(UE)** *and for any $T > 0$,*

$$\lim_{|z-z'|\to 0} \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|\sigma_t(z) - \sigma_t(z')\| = 0,$$

and $b \in L^q_{loc}(\mathbb{R}_+; L^q(\mathbb{R}^{2d}))$ for some $q \in (2(2d+1), \infty]$. Then for any $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, there exists a unique probability measure-valued solution $\mu_t \in$

$\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ *to* (1.3) *in the distributional sense in the class that* $t \mapsto \mu_t$ *is weakly continuous with* $\mu_0 = \nu$ *and*

$$\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (|\mathrm{v}| + |b_s(x, \mathrm{v})|)\mu_s(\mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}\mathrm{v})\mathrm{d}s < \infty, \quad t > 0.$$

The proof of this result is based on Figalli and Trevisan's superposition characterization for the solutions of Fokker-Planck equation in terms of martingale problem associated with σ and b. More precisely, Figalli [14] and Trevisan [33] showed that for any weakly continuous probability measure-valued solution μ_t of (1.3) with initial value $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, there exists a martingale solution for operator $\mathscr{L}_t^{a,b}$ (a probability measure $\mathbb{P}_\nu$ over the space of all continuous functions from $\mathbb{R}_+$ to $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ denoted by Ω) such that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \varphi(\mathrm{z})\mu_t(\mathrm{d}\mathrm{z}) = \int_\Omega \varphi(\omega_t)\mathbb{P}_\nu(\mathrm{d}\omega),$$

where $t \mapsto \omega_t$ is the coordinate process over Ω. Hence, in order to prove Theorem 1.3, it suffices to show the well-posedness of martingale problem for $\mathscr{L}_t^{a,b}$ in the sense of Stroock and Varadhan [31]. This will be achieved by proving some Krylov's type estimate (see Theorem 4.3 below), which is also a key tool for proving Theorem 1.1. It is remarked that in [28], we have already used this technique to show the uniqueness of measure-valued solutions and L^p-solutions to possibly degenerate second order Fokker-Planck equations under some weak conditions on the coefficients (but not the case of Theorem 1.3).

This paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we introduce some anisotropic fractional Bessel potential spaces, and prepare some useful estimates for later use. In Section 3, we show the L^p-maximal regularity estimate for kinetic Fokker-Planck equations. In Section 4, we study the martingale problem associated with (σ, b) under the same assumptions as in Theorem 1.3 by showing the basic Krylov's type estimate. In particular, we first prove Theorem 1.3. In Section 5, we then prove Theorem 1.1 by using Zvonkin's transformation and Krylov's estimate obtained in the previous section. In Appendix, a stochastic Gronwall's type lemma used in Section 5 is given.

Convention: The letter C with or without subscripts will denote an unimportant constant, whose value may change in different places. Moreover, $A \preceq B$ means that $A \leqslant CB$ for some constant $C > 0$, and $A \asymp B$ means that $C^{-1}B \leqslant A \leqslant CB$ for some $C > 1$.

After this work was finished, I was informed by Professor Enrico Priola during "The 8th International Conference on Stochastic Analysis and its Applications" held at BIT that, very recently, Fedrizzi, Flandoli, Priola and Vovelle [13] also obtained the strong well-posedness together with their

flow property of SDE (1.1) under the conditions $\sigma_t(z) = \mathbb{I}$ and $b_t(z) = b(z)$ possessing the following regularity

$$\|(\mathbb{I} - \Delta_x)^{s/2} b\|_p < \infty$$

for some $s > 2/3$ and $p > 6d$.

2. Preliminaries

For $\alpha \geqslant 0$ and $p \in (1, \infty)$, let $H_p^\alpha := H_p^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d) := (\mathbb{I} - \Delta)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}(L^p(\mathbb{R}^d))$ be the usual Bessel potential space with norm

$$\|f\|_{\alpha,p} := \|(\mathbb{I} - \Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} f\|_p,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_p$ is the usual L^p-norm, and Δ is the Laplacian. For $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, let $\Delta^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} := -(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ be the usual fractional Laplacian. Notice that up to a constant $C(\alpha, d) > 0$, an alternative definition of $\Delta^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ is given by

$$\Delta^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} f(x) := \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{|y| \geqslant \varepsilon} \delta_y f(x) |y|^{-d-\alpha} \mathrm{d}y, \quad \delta_y f(x) := f(x + y) - f(x). \tag{2.1}$$

We will frequently use such a definition below. It is well-known that by the boundedness of Riesz's transformation (cf. [30]),

$$\|\Delta^{\frac{1}{2}} f\|_p \asymp \|\nabla f\|_p, \ p > 1, \tag{2.2}$$

and an equivalent norm in H_p^α is given by

$$\|f\|_{\alpha,p} \asymp \|f\|_p + \|\Delta^{\frac{\alpha-[\alpha]}{2}} \nabla^{[\alpha]} f\|_p, \tag{2.3}$$

where $[\alpha]$ is the integer part of real number α, and we have used the convention $\Delta^0 := \mathbb{I}$. Notice that for $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $p > 1$,

$$\|f(\cdot + x) - f(\cdot)\|_p \leq \|\Delta^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} f\|_p |x|^\alpha, \tag{2.4}$$

and in particular,

$$\|f(\cdot + x) - f(\cdot)\|_p \leq \|f\|_{\alpha,p} (|x|^\alpha \wedge 1). \tag{2.5}$$

Moreover, we also have the following interpolation inequality: for any $0 \leqslant \alpha < \beta < \infty$,

$$\|f\|_{\alpha,p} \leqslant C(p, d, \alpha, \beta) \|f\|_p^{\frac{\beta-\alpha}{\beta}} \|f\|_{\beta,p}^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}, \tag{2.6}$$

and the following Sobolev embedding results hold: for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, if $p\alpha > d$, then

$$\|f\|_\infty + \sup_{x \neq y} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{|x - y|^\gamma} \leqslant C(p, d, \alpha, \gamma) \|f\|_{\alpha,p}, \ \gamma \in (0, \alpha - \tfrac{d}{p}); \tag{2.7}$$

if $p\alpha < d$, then

$$\|f\|_q \leqslant C(p, d, \alpha, q) \|f\|_{\alpha,p}, \quad q \in [p, \tfrac{pd}{d - p\alpha}]. \tag{2.8}$$

All the above facts are standard and can be found in [2] and [30].

To treat the kinetic Fokker-Planck operator, we introduce the following anisotropic Bessel potential spaces. Let $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ be the space of all smooth functions on $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ with compact supports. For $\alpha,\beta\geqslant 0$, we define the Bessel potential space $H_p^{\alpha,\beta}:=H_p^{\alpha,\beta}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ as the completion of $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ with respect to norm:

$$\|f\|_{\alpha,\beta;p}:=\|(\mathbb{I}-\Delta_x)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}f\|_p+\|(\mathbb{I}-\Delta_{\rm v})^{\frac{\beta}{2}}f\|_p.$$

Notice that by the Mihlin multiplier theorem (cf. [2]),

$$\|f\|_{\alpha,\beta;p}\asymp\|f\|_p+\|\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}f\|_p+\|\Delta_{\rm v}^{\frac{\beta}{2}}f\|_p\asymp\|((\mathbb{I}-\Delta_x)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}+(\mathbb{I}-\Delta_{\rm v})^{\frac{\beta}{2}})f\|_p.$$

In the following, we simply write

$$H_p^{\infty,\infty}:=H_p^{\infty,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{2d}):=\cap_{\alpha,\beta\geqslant 0}H_p^{\alpha,\beta}(\mathbb{R}^{2d}).$$

Lemma 2.1. *(i) For any $\alpha,\beta\geqslant 0$, $\theta\in[0,1]$ and $p>1$, there is a constant $C=C(\alpha,\beta,\theta,p,d)>0$ such that*

$$\|(\mathbb{I}-\Delta_x)^{\frac{\theta\alpha}{2}}(\mathbb{I}-\Delta_{\rm v})^{\frac{(1-\theta)\beta}{2}}f\|_p\leqslant C\|f\|_{\alpha,\beta;p},\tag{2.9}$$

$$\|\Delta_x^{\frac{\theta\alpha}{2}}\Delta_{\rm v}^{\frac{(1-\theta)\alpha}{2}}f\|_p\leqslant C\|(\Delta_x+\Delta_{\rm v})^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}f\|_p.\tag{2.10}$$

In particular, for any $\alpha\geqslant 0$, $\beta\geqslant 1$ and $p>1$, we have

$$\|\nabla_{\rm v}f\|_{\alpha(\beta-1)/\beta,\beta-1;p}\leqslant C\|f\|_{\alpha,\beta;p}.\tag{2.11}$$

(ii) Let $\alpha,\beta\geqslant 0$ and $p>1$ with $d\neq\frac{p\alpha\beta}{\alpha+\beta}$. Set

$$p^*:=\begin{cases}dp/(d-\frac{p\alpha\beta}{\alpha+\beta}), & d>\frac{p\alpha\beta}{\alpha+\beta};\\ \infty, & d<\frac{p\alpha\beta}{\alpha+\beta}.\end{cases}$$

For any $q\in[p,p^*]$, there is a constant $C=C(\alpha,\beta,p,q,d)>0$ such that

$$\|f\|_q\leqslant C\|f\|_{\alpha,\beta;p}.\tag{2.12}$$

Proof. (i) It follows by the Mihlin multiplier theorem and (2.2).

(ii) For (2.12), by (2.7), (2.8) and (2.9) with $\theta=\frac{\beta}{\alpha+\beta}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|f\|_q^q&=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\|f(\cdot,{\rm v})\|_q^q{\rm d}{\rm v}\preceq\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\|(\mathbb{I}-\Delta_x)^{\frac{\theta\alpha}{2}}f(\cdot,{\rm v})\|_p^q{\rm d}{\rm v}\\&\leqslant\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|(\mathbb{I}-\Delta_x)^{\frac{\theta\alpha}{2}}f(x,{\rm v})|^q{\rm d}{\rm v}\right)^{p/q}{\rm d}x\right)^{q/p}\\&\preceq\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\|(\mathbb{I}-\Delta_{\rm v})^{\frac{(1-\theta)\beta}{2}}(\mathbb{I}-\Delta_x)^{\frac{\theta\alpha}{2}}f(x,\cdot)\|_p^p{\rm d}x\right)^{q/p}\preceq\|f\|_{\alpha,\beta;p}^q,\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is due to Minkovskii's inequality. □

Let $a:\mathbb{R}^{2d}\to\mathbb{R}^d\otimes\mathbb{R}^d$ be a measurable function. Write

$$\mathscr{L}^a u:={\rm tr}(a\cdot\nabla_{\rm v}^2u)+{\rm v}\cdot\nabla_x u.$$

We have

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $p > d/\alpha$. Suppose that*

$$\kappa_0 := \sup_{\mathrm{v}} \|\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} a(\cdot, \mathrm{v})\|_p + \|a\|_\infty < \infty.$$

For any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, there is a constant $C_\varepsilon = C_\varepsilon(p, d, \alpha, \kappa_0) > 0$ such that for all $u \in H_p^{\infty,\infty}$,

$$\|[\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \mathscr{L}^a]u\|_p \leqslant \varepsilon \|\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u\|_p + C_\varepsilon \|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u\|_p, \tag{2.13}$$

where $[\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \mathscr{L}^a]u := \Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\mathscr{L}^a u) - \mathscr{L}^a(\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u)$.

Proof. Notice that by definition (2.1),

$$[\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \mathscr{L}^a]u = \mathrm{tr}(\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} a \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathrm{tr}(\delta_{(y,0)} a \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 \delta_{(y,0)} u) |y|^{-d-\alpha} \mathrm{d}y.$$

Hence,

$$\|[\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \mathscr{L}^a]u\|_p \leqslant \|\mathrm{tr}(\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} a \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u)\|_p + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left\|\mathrm{tr}(\delta_{(y,0)} a \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 \delta_{(y,0)} u)\right\|_p |y|^{-d-\alpha} \mathrm{d}y.$$

Let $\beta \in (\frac{d}{p}, \alpha)$. By (2.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathrm{tr}(\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} a \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u)\|_p^p &\preceq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} a(\cdot, \mathrm{v})\|_p^p \|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u(\cdot, \mathrm{v})\|_\infty^p \mathrm{d}\mathrm{v} \\
&\preceq \sup_{\mathrm{v}} \|\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} a(\cdot, \mathrm{v})\|_p^p \|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u\|_{\beta,0;p}^p,
\end{aligned}$$

and for $\gamma \in (0, \beta - \frac{d}{p})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\mathrm{tr}(\delta_{(y,0)} a \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 \delta_{(y,0)} u)\right\|_p^p &\preceq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|\delta_y a(\cdot, \mathrm{v})\|_p^p \cdot \|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 \delta_y u(\cdot, \mathrm{v})\|_\infty^p \mathrm{d}\mathrm{v} \\
&\overset{(2.4)}{\preceq} |y|^{(\alpha+\gamma)p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} a(\cdot, \mathrm{v})\|_p^p \|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u(\cdot, \mathrm{v})\|_{\beta,p}^p \mathrm{d}\mathrm{v} \\
&\preceq |y|^{(\alpha+\gamma)p} \sup_{\mathrm{v}} \|\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} a(\cdot, \mathrm{v})\|_p^p \|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u\|_{\beta,0;p}^p.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, it is easy to see that

$$\left\|\mathrm{tr}(\delta_{(y,0)} a \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 \delta_{(y,0)} u)\right\|_p \preceq \|a\|_\infty \|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u\|_p.$$

Therefore,

$$\left\|\mathrm{tr}(\delta_{(y,0)} a \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 \delta_{(y,0)} u)\right\|_p \preceq \kappa_0 (|y|^{\alpha+\gamma} \wedge 1) \|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u\|_{\beta,0;p}.$$

Combining the above calculations, we get for some $C = C(p, d, \alpha, \beta) > 0$,

$$\|[\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \mathscr{L}^a]u\|_p \leqslant C\kappa_0 \|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u\|_{\beta,0;p}, \tag{2.14}$$

On the other hand, by the interpolation inequality (2.6) and Young's inequality, we have for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$,

$$\|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u\|_{\beta,0;p} \preceq \|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u\|_{\alpha,0;p}^{\frac{\beta}{\alpha}} \|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u\|_p^{\frac{\alpha-\beta}{\alpha}} \leqslant \varepsilon \|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u\|_{\alpha,0;p} + C_\varepsilon \|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u\|_p.$$

Estimate (2.13) now follows by (2.14). □

Lemma 2.3. *For any $\alpha,\beta\in(0,1)$ and $p>(\alpha+\beta)d/(\alpha\beta)$, there is a constant $C=C(\alpha,\beta,p,d)>0$ such that for all $b\in H_p^{\alpha,0}$ and $u\in H_p^{\infty,\infty}$,*

$$\|b\cdot\nabla_{\rm v}u\|_{\alpha,0;p}\leqslant C\|b\|_{\alpha,0;p}\Big(\|\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\nabla_{\rm v}u\|_{0,\beta;p}+\|\nabla_{\rm v}u\|_{0,\beta;p}\Big).$$

Proof. Notice that by (2.3),

$$\|b\cdot\nabla_{\rm v}u\|_{\alpha,0;p}\preceq\|b\cdot\nabla_{\rm v}u\|_p+\|\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}(b\cdot\nabla_{\rm v}u)\|_p.$$

By definition (2.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}(b\cdot\nabla_{\rm v}u)\|_p&\leqslant\|(\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}b)\cdot\nabla_{\rm v}u\|_p+\|b\cdot\nabla_{\rm v}\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}u\|_p\\&\quad+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Big\|\delta_{(y,0)}b\cdot\nabla_{\rm v}\delta_{(y,0)}u\Big\|_p|y|^{-d-\alpha}{\rm d}y=:I_1+I_2+I_3.\end{aligned}$$

For I_1, since $p>(\alpha+\beta)d/(\alpha\beta)$, by (2.12) with $q=\infty$, we have

$$I_1\preceq\|\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}b\|_p\|\nabla_{\rm v}u\|_\infty\preceq\|b\|_{\alpha,0;p}\|\nabla_{\rm v}u\|_{\alpha,\beta;p}.$$

For I_2, since $p\alpha>d$, by (2.7) we have

$$\begin{aligned}I_2^p&=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\|b(\cdot,{\rm v})\cdot\nabla_{\rm v}\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}u(\cdot,{\rm v})\|_p^p{\rm d}{\rm v}\\&\leq\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\|b(\cdot,{\rm v})\|_\infty^p\|\nabla_{\rm v}\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}u(\cdot,{\rm v})\|_p^p{\rm d}{\rm v}\\&\leq\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\|b(\cdot,{\rm v})\|_{\alpha,p}^p{\rm d}{\rm v}\sup_{\rm v}\|\nabla_{\rm v}\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}u(\cdot,{\rm v})\|_p^p.\end{aligned}$$

For I_3, by (2.5) and (2.7) again, we have for any $\gamma\in(0,\alpha-\frac{d}{p})$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\|\delta_y b(\cdot,{\rm v})\cdot\nabla_{\rm v}\delta_y u(\cdot,{\rm v})\|_p^p{\rm d}{\rm v}&\preceq\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\|\delta_y b(\cdot,{\rm v})\|_p^p\|\delta_y\nabla_{\rm v}u(\cdot,{\rm v})\|_\infty^p{\rm d}{\rm v}\\&\leq\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\|b(\cdot,{\rm v})\|_{\alpha,p}^p(|y|^{\alpha p}\wedge1)\|\nabla_{\rm v}u(\cdot,{\rm v})\|_{\alpha,p}^p(|y|^{\gamma p}\wedge1){\rm d}{\rm v}\\&\leq\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\|b(\cdot,{\rm v})\|_{\alpha,p}^p{\rm d}{\rm v}\right)\sup_{\rm v}\|\nabla_{\rm v}u(\cdot,{\rm v})\|_{\alpha,p}^p(|y|^{(\alpha+\gamma)p}\wedge1).\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, notice that by $p\beta>d$ and (2.7),

$$\sup_{\rm v}\|\nabla_{\rm v}\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}u(\cdot,{\rm v})\|_p^p\leqslant\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\sup_{\rm v}|\nabla_{\rm v}\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}u(x,{\rm v})|^p{\rm d}x\preceq\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\|\nabla_{\rm v}\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}u(x,\cdot)\|_{\beta,p}^p{\rm d}x,$$

and similarly,

$$\|b\cdot\nabla_{\rm v}u\|_p^p\preceq\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\|b(\cdot,{\rm v})\|_{\alpha,p}^p\|\nabla_{\rm v}u(\cdot,{\rm v})\|_p^p{\rm d}{\rm v}\preceq\|b\|_{\alpha,0;p}^p\|\nabla_{\rm v}u\|_{0,\beta;p}^p.$$

Combining the above calculations, we obtain the desired estimate. □

Let $\varrho : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to [0,\infty)$ be a smooth function with support in the unit ball and $\int \varrho = 1$. Define

$$\varrho_\varepsilon(z) := \varepsilon^{-2d}\varrho(\varepsilon^{-1}z), \quad \varepsilon \in (0,1), \tag{2.15}$$

and for a locally integrable function $u : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$u_\varepsilon(z) := u * \varrho_\varepsilon(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} u(z')\varrho_\varepsilon(z - z')\mathrm{d}z'.$$

Let $\mathscr{P}$ be an operator on the space of locally integrable functions. We define

$$[\varrho_\varepsilon, \mathscr{P}]u := (\mathscr{P}u) * \varrho_\varepsilon - \mathscr{P}(u * \varrho_\varepsilon). \tag{2.16}$$

We need the following commutator estimate results.

Lemma 2.4. *(i) Let $p \in [1,\infty)$ and $q, r \in [p,\infty]$ with $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{r}$. For any $b \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ and $u \in H^{0,1}_r$, we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \|[\varrho_\varepsilon, b \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}]u\|_p = 0. \tag{2.17}$$

(ii) Let $a : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded measurable function. For any $p \in [1,\infty)$ and $u \in H^{0,2}_p$, we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \|[\varrho_\varepsilon, \mathscr{L}^a]u\|_p = 0. \tag{2.18}$$

Proof. (i) It follows by [40, Lemma 4.2].

(ii) By definition, we can write for $z = (x, \mathrm{v})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
[\varrho_\varepsilon, \mathscr{L}^a]u(z) &= (\mathscr{L}^a u) * \varrho_\varepsilon(z) - \mathscr{L}^a(u * \varrho_\varepsilon)(z) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \mathrm{tr}((a(z') - a(z)) \cdot \nabla^2_{\mathrm{v}} u(z'))\varrho_\varepsilon(z - z')\mathrm{d}z' \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (\mathrm{v}' - \mathrm{v}) \cdot \nabla_x u(z')\varrho_\varepsilon(z - z')\mathrm{d}z' \\
&=: I^\varepsilon_1(t,z) + I^\varepsilon_2(t,z).
\end{aligned}$$

For $I^\varepsilon_1(t,z)$, by Jensen's inequality and the assumption, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|I^\varepsilon_1(t,z)|^p &\leqslant \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |\mathrm{tr}((a(z') - a(z)) \cdot \nabla^2_{\mathrm{v}} u(z'))|^p \varrho_\varepsilon(z - z')\mathrm{d}z' \\
&\leqslant (2\|a\|_\infty)^p \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \|\nabla^2_{\mathrm{v}} u(z')\|^p \varrho_\varepsilon(z - z')\mathrm{d}z'.
\end{aligned}$$

For $I^\varepsilon_2(t,z)$, by the integration by parts and Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|I^\varepsilon_2(t,z)|^p &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (\mathrm{v}' - \mathrm{v}) \cdot \nabla_x \varrho_\varepsilon(z - z')u(z')\mathrm{d}z' \right|^p \\
&\leqslant \varepsilon^p \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |\nabla_x \varrho_\varepsilon(z - z')| \cdot |u(z')|\mathrm{d}z' \right)^p
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leqslant \varepsilon^p \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |\nabla_x \varrho_\varepsilon(z)| \mathrm{d}z\right)^{p-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |\nabla_x \varrho_\varepsilon(z-z')| \cdot |u(z')|^p \mathrm{d}z'$$
$$= \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |\nabla_x \varrho(z)| \mathrm{d}z\right)^{p-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |(\nabla_x \varrho)_\varepsilon(z-z')| \cdot |u(z')|^p \mathrm{d}z'.$$

Combining the above calculations, we get

$$\|[\varrho_\varepsilon, \mathscr{L}^a]u\|_p \leqslant C\|u\|_{0,2;p}.$$

Hence, for any $u \in H_p^{0,2}$, it is easy to see that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon'\to 0} \sup_{\varepsilon\in(0,1)} \|[\varrho_\varepsilon, \mathscr{L}^a](u_{\varepsilon'} - u)\|_p \leqslant C \lim_{\varepsilon'\to 0} \|u_{\varepsilon'} - u\|_{0,2;p} = 0. \tag{2.19}$$

Moreover, for fixed $\varepsilon' \in (0,1)$, since $u_{\varepsilon'} \in H_p^{\infty,\infty}$, by [40, Lemma 4.2] we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \|[\varrho_\varepsilon, \mathscr{L}^a]u_{\varepsilon'}\|_p = 0,$$

which together with (2.19) implies (2.18). □

Let $\sigma_t(x,\mathrm{v}) = \sigma_t$ be independent of (x,v). Define for $t < s$,

$$P_{t,s} f(x,\mathrm{v}) = \mathbb{E} f(x + (s-t)\mathrm{v} + X_{t,s}, \mathrm{v} + V_{t,s}), \tag{2.20}$$

where

$$(X_{t,s}, V_{t,s}) = \left(\int_t^s V_{t,r}\mathrm{d}r, \int_t^s \sigma_r \mathrm{d}W_r\right).$$

We need the following basic L^p-regularity estimates related to $P_{t,s}$, which plays a basic role in the next section.

Theorem 2.5. *Let $T > 0$. Suppose that for some $K > 0$ and all $t \in [0,T]$,*

$$K^{-1}|\xi| \leqslant |\sigma_t^* \xi| \leqslant K|\xi|, \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

(i) For any $\alpha, \beta \geqslant 0$ and $p > 1$, there exists a positive constant $C = C(K,T,p,d,\alpha,\beta)$ such that for all $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ and $0 \leqslant t < s \leqslant T$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{t,s} f\|_{\alpha,0;p} &\leqslant C(s-t)^{-\frac{3\alpha}{2}} \|f\|_p, \\ \|P_{t,s} f\|_{0,\beta;p} &\leqslant C(s-t)^{-\frac{\beta}{2}} \|f\|_p. \end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

(ii) For any $p > 1$, there exists a positive constant $C_p = C_p(K,d)$ such that for all $\lambda \geqslant 0$ and $f \in \mathbb{L}^p(T) = L^p([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d})$,

$$\|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u^\lambda\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} + \|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}} u^\lambda\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} \leqslant C_p \|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)}, \tag{2.22}$$

where $u_t^\lambda(x,\mathrm{v}) := \int_t^T \mathrm{e}^{\lambda(t-s)} P_{t,s} f_s(x,\mathrm{v})\mathrm{d}s$ satisfies

$$\partial_t u^\lambda + \mathscr{L}_t^{a,0} u^\lambda - \lambda u^\lambda + f = 0$$

in the distributional sense.

Proof. (i) It follows by the following gradient estimate and the interpolation theorem (see [36, Theorem 2.10]),

$$\|\nabla_x^k \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^m P_{t,s} f\|_p \leqslant C(s-t)^{-\frac{3k+m}{2}} \|f\|_p,\ k, m \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

(ii) It is a consequence of [6] and [5, Theorem 2.1] (see also [8, Theorem 3.3]). □

Remark 2.6. *Notice that in the references* [36] *and* [8]*, the positions of t and s are exchanged.*

3. Maximal L^p-solutions of kinetic Fokker-Planck equations

Throughout this section, we fix $T > 0$. Let $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $\alpha, \beta \geqslant 0$. For $t \in [0, T]$, we introduce the following Banach spaces with natural norms:

$$\mathbb{L}^p(t, T) := L^p([t, T]; L^p(\mathbb{R}^{2d})),\ \ \mathbb{H}_p^{\alpha,\beta}(t, T) := L^p([t, T]; H_p^{\alpha,\beta}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})).$$

For simplicity of notation, we write

$$\mathbb{L}^p(T) := \mathbb{L}^p(0, T),\ \ \mathbb{H}_p^{\alpha,\beta}(T) := \mathbb{H}_p^{\alpha,\beta}(0, T).$$

We assume that $a : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$ is symmetric and satisfies that for some $K \geqslant 1$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} K^{-1} \cdot \mathbb{I} \leqslant a_t(z) \leqslant K \cdot \mathbb{I},\ (t, z) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d} \\ \omega_a(\delta) := \sup\limits_{|z-z'| \leqslant \delta} \sup\limits_{t \in [0,T]} \|a_t(z) - a_t(z')\| \leqslant \frac{1}{2(C_p+1)} \end{array} \right\}, \tag{$\mathbf{H}_K^{\delta,p}$}$$

where C_p is the same as in (2.22). Here and in the remainder of this paper, $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Hilbert-Schmidt norm. For $\lambda \geqslant 0$, consider the following backward kinetic Fokker-Planck equation

$$\partial_t u + \mathscr{L}_t^{a,b} u - \lambda u + f = 0,\ \ u_T = 0, \tag{3.1}$$

where $f_t(x, \mathrm{v}) : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a Borel function. We first introduce the following notion of solutions to the above equation.

Definition 3.1. *Let $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $f \in \mathbb{L}^p(T)$. A Borel function $u \in \mathbb{H}_p^{0,2}(T)$ is called a solution of* (3.1) *if for any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ and all $t \in [0, T]$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u_t, \varphi \rangle = &\int_t^T \langle \mathrm{tr}(a_s \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u_s), \varphi \rangle \mathrm{d}s - \int_t^T \langle \mathrm{v} \cdot \nabla_x \varphi, u_s \rangle \mathrm{d}s \\ &+ \int_t^T \langle b_s \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}} u_s, \varphi \rangle \mathrm{d}s - \lambda \int_t^T \langle u_s, \varphi \rangle \mathrm{d}s + \int_t^T \langle f_s, \varphi \rangle \mathrm{d}s, \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

where $\langle u_t, \varphi \rangle := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} u_t(z) \varphi(z) \mathrm{d}z$.

The main aim of this section is to show that

Theorem 3.2. *Let $\alpha \in [0, \frac{2}{3})$, $\beta \in (1,2)$ and $p > \frac{2}{(2-3\alpha)\wedge(2-\beta)}$ be not equal to $\frac{d(\alpha+\beta)}{\alpha(\beta-1)}$. Suppose that a satisfies* **($\mathbf{H}_K^{\delta,p}$)**, *and for some $q \in [p \vee \frac{d(\alpha+\beta)}{\alpha(\beta-1)}, \infty]$,*

$$\kappa_0 := \|b\|_{L^p([0,T];L^q(\mathbb{R}^{2d}))} < \infty.$$

(i) For any $f \in \mathbb{L}^p(T)$, there exists a unique solution $u = u^\lambda$ to (3.1) *in the sense of Definition 3.1 with*

$$\|u^\lambda\|_{\mathbb{H}_p^{2/3,2}(T)} \leqslant C\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)}, \tag{3.3}$$

and for all $t \in [0,T]$,

$$\|u_t^\lambda\|_{\alpha,\beta;p} \leqslant C((T-t)\wedge\lambda^{-1})^{1-\frac{1}{p}-\frac{(3\alpha)\vee\beta}{2}}\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}, \tag{3.4}$$

where the constant C only depends on $d, \delta, K, \alpha, \beta, p, q, T$ and κ_0.

(ii) If in addition, we also assume that $p > \frac{d(3\beta-1)}{2(\beta-1)}$ and

$$\kappa_1 := \sup_{t,\mathrm{v}} \|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}}\sigma_t(\cdot,\mathrm{v})\|_p + \|b\|_{\mathbb{H}_p^{2/3,0}(T)} < \infty,$$

then for any $f \in \mathbb{H}_p^{2/3,0}(T)$, the unique solution u also satisfies

$$\|\nabla_x\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}u^\lambda\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} + \|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}}\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2u^\lambda\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} \leqslant C\|f\|_{\mathbb{H}_p^{2/3,0}(T)}, \tag{3.5}$$

and for all $t \in [0,T]$,

$$\|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}}u_t^\lambda\|_{\alpha,\beta;p} \leqslant C((T-t)\wedge\lambda^{-1})^{1-\frac{1}{p}-\frac{(3\alpha)\vee\beta}{2}}\|f\|_{\mathbb{H}_p^{2/3,0}(t,T)}, \tag{3.6}$$

where the constant C only depends on $d, \delta, K, \alpha, \beta, p, T$ and κ_1.

Remark 3.3. *In order to emphasize the dependence of the unique solution u on a, b and T, λ, f, we sometimes denote $u = \mathcal{R}_{\lambda,T}^{a,b}(f)$.*

3.1. **Case $b = 0$.** In this subsection we first consider the case of $b = 0$ by using the freezing coefficient argument, and show the following basic existence and uniqueness result for equation (3.1).

Theorem 3.4. *Let $p > 1$ and $\alpha \in [0, \frac{2}{3})$, $\beta \in [0,2)$. Suppose* **($\mathbf{H}_K^{\delta,p}$)** *holds.*

(i) For any $f \in \mathbb{L}^p(T)$, there exists a unique solution $u = u^\lambda$ to (3.1) *in the sense of Definition 3.1 so that*

$$\|u^\lambda\|_{\mathbb{H}_p^{2/3,2}(T)} \leqslant C_1\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)}. \tag{3.7}$$

(ii) If $p > \frac{2}{(2-3\alpha)\wedge(2-\beta)}$, then for all $t \in [0,T]$,

$$\|u_t^\lambda\|_{\alpha,\beta;p} \leqslant C_2((T-t)\wedge\lambda^{-1})^{1-\frac{1}{p}-\frac{(3\alpha)\vee\beta}{2}}\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}. \tag{3.8}$$

Here $C_1 = C_1(d,\delta,K,p,T)$ and $C_2 = C_2(d,\delta,K,\alpha,\beta,p,T)$ are increasing with respect to T.

Proof. We show the apriori estimates (3.7) and (3.8) by the freezing coefficient argument. The existence of a solution follows by the standard continuity argument. We divide the proof into five steps.

(a) First of all, we assume that $u \in C([0,T]; H_p^{\infty,\infty})$ satisfies (3.1) for Lebesgue almost all $t \in [0,T]$. For given $p \geqslant 1$, let ϕ be a nonnegative symmetric smooth function on $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ with support in the unit ball and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |\phi(z)|^p \mathrm{d}z = 1.$$

Let $\delta \in (0,1)$ be as in $\mathbf{(H}_K^{\delta,p}\mathbf{)}$ and set

$$\phi_\delta(z) := \delta^{-2d/p}\phi(z/\delta),$$

and for $z^o = (x^o, \mathrm{v}^o)$ and $t \in [0,T]$, define

$$z_t^o := (x^o - t\mathrm{v}^o, \mathrm{v}^o),\ \phi_\delta^{z_t^o}(z) := \phi_\delta(z_t^o - z).$$

By definition, it is easy to see that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |\phi_\delta^{z_t^o}(z)|^p \mathrm{d}z^o = 1,\quad t \in [0,T],\ z \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}, \tag{3.9}$$

and for $j = 1, 2$,

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\sup_{z\in\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^j \phi_\delta^{z_t^o}(z)|^p \mathrm{d}z^o \leqslant C_\delta. \tag{3.10}$$

Define the freezing functions at point $z^o = (x^o, \mathrm{v}^o)$ as follows:

$$a_t^{z^o} := a_t(z_t^o),\quad u_{\delta,t}^{z^o}(z) := u_t(z)\phi_\delta^{z_t^o}(z).$$

By (3.1) and easy calculations, one sees that

$$\partial_t u_\delta^{z^o} + \mathrm{tr}(a_t^{z^o} \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u_\delta^{z^o}) + \mathrm{v}\cdot\nabla_x u_\delta^{z^o} - \lambda u_\delta^{z^o} = g_\delta^{z^o}, \tag{3.11}$$

where for $z = (x, \mathrm{v})$,

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\delta,t}^{z^o}(z) :=\ & \mathrm{tr}(a_t^{z^o} \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u_{\delta,t}^{z^o})(z) - \mathrm{tr}(a_t \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u_t)(z)\phi_\delta^{z_t^o}(z) \\ & + (\mathrm{v} - \mathrm{v}^o)\cdot\nabla_x \phi_\delta^{z_t^o}(z) u_t(z) + f_t(z)\phi_\delta^{z_t^o}(z). \end{aligned}$$

We have the following *claim:*

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \|g_\delta^{z^o}\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}^p \mathrm{d}z^o\right)^{1/p} &\leqslant \omega_a(\delta)\|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)} \\ &\quad + C_\delta\Big(\|u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)} + \|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}\Big),\quad t \in [0,T]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

Proof of the claim: Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\delta,t}^{z^o}(z) =\ & \mathrm{tr}((a_t^{z^o} - a_t)\cdot\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u_t)(z)\phi_\delta^{z_t^o}(z) + \mathrm{tr}(a_t^{z^o}\cdot(\nabla_{\mathrm{v}} u_t \otimes \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}\phi_\delta^{z_t^o}))(z) \\ & + [\mathrm{tr}(a_t^{z^o}\cdot\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2\phi_\delta^{z_t^o})(z) + (\mathrm{v} - \mathrm{v}^o)\cdot\nabla_x\phi_\delta^{z_t^o}(z)]u_t(z) + f_t(z)\phi_\delta^{z_t^o}(z) \\ =:\ & I_1^\delta(t,z,z^o) + I_2^\delta(t,z,z^o) + I_3^\delta(t,z,z^o) + I_4^\delta(t,z,z^o). \end{aligned}$$

For $I_1^\delta(t,z,z^o)$, since the support of ϕ_δ is in $B_\delta := \{z \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} : |z| \leqslant \delta\}$, by the definition of $\omega_a(\delta)$ and (3.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \|I_1^\delta(\cdot,\cdot,z^o)\|^p_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}\mathrm{d}z^o\right)^{1/p} &\leqslant \omega_a(\delta)\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u\cdot\phi_\delta^{z^o_\cdot}\|^p_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}\mathrm{d}z^o\right)^{1/p}\\ &= \omega_a(\delta)\|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}.\end{aligned}$$

For $I_2^\delta(t,z,z^o)$, by (3.10) we have

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \|I_2^\delta(\cdot,\cdot,z^o)\|^p_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}\mathrm{d}z^o\right)^{1/p} \leqslant C_\delta\|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}} u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}.$$

For $I_3^\delta(t,z,z^o)$, we similarly have

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \|I_3^\delta(\cdot,\cdot,z^o)\|^p_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}\mathrm{d}z^o\right)^{1/p} \leqslant C_\delta\|u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}.$$

For $I_4^\delta(t,z,z^o)$, by (3.9) we have

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \|I_4^\delta(\cdot,\cdot,z^o)\|^p_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}\mathrm{d}z^o\right)^{1/p} = \|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}.$$

Combining the above calculations, and by the interpolation inequality (2.6) and Young's inequality, we get the claim.

Now by (3.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)} &= \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \|(\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u)\phi_\delta^{z^o_\cdot}\|^p_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}\mathrm{d}z^o\right)^{1/p}\\ &\leqslant \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2(u\phi_\delta^{z^o_\cdot}) - (\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u)\phi_\delta^{z^o_\cdot}\|^p_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}\mathrm{d}z^o\right)^{1/p}\\ &\quad + \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u_\delta^{z^o}\|^p_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}\mathrm{d}z^o\right)^{1/p} =: I_1 + I_2.\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

For I_1, by (3.10) and the interpolation inequality, we have

$$I_1 \leqslant C_\delta\Big(\|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}} u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)} + \|u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}\Big) \leqslant \omega_a(\delta)\|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)} + C_\delta\|u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}.$$

For I_2, noticing that by (3.11) and Duhamel's formula,

$$u^{z^o}_{\delta,t}(z) = \int_t^T \mathrm{e}^{\lambda(t-s)}P^{z^o}_{t,s}g^{z^o}_{\delta,s}(z)\mathrm{d}s, \tag{3.14}$$

where $P^{z^o}_{t,s}$ is defined by (2.20) in terms of $\sigma^{z^o}_t := (a^{z^o}_t)^{1/2}$, by (2.22) and (3.12), we have

$$I_2 \leqslant C_0\bigg(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \|g^{z^o}_\delta\|^p_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}\mathrm{d}z^o\bigg)^{1/p} \leqslant C_0\omega_a(\delta)\|\nabla^2_{\mathrm{v}}u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)} + C_\delta\Big(\|u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)} + C\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}\Big).$$

Substituting these two estimates into (3.13) and by $\omega_a(\delta) \leqslant \frac{1}{2(C_0+1)}$, we get

$$\|\nabla^2_{\mathrm{v}}u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)} \leqslant C\Big(\|u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)} + \|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}\Big). \tag{3.15}$$

Similarly, one can show that (see also step (c) below)

$$\|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}}u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)} \leqslant C\Big(\|u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)} + \|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}\Big). \tag{3.16}$$

(b) By (3.14) and the contraction of operator $P^{z^o}_{t,s}$ in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_t\|^p_p &\overset{(3.9)}{=} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \|u^{z^o}_{\delta,t}\|^p_p\mathrm{d}z^o \leqslant \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\bigg(\int_t^T \|g^{z^o}_{\delta,s}\|_p\mathrm{d}s\bigg)^p\mathrm{d}z^o\\
&\leqslant \bigg(\int_t^T \mathrm{e}^{p\lambda(t-s)/(p-1)}\mathrm{d}s\bigg)^{p-1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\int_t^T \|g^{z^o}_{\delta,s}\|^p_p\mathrm{d}s\mathrm{d}z^o\\
&\overset{(3.12)}{\preceq} ((T-t)\wedge\lambda^{-1})^{p-1}\Big(\|\nabla^2_{\mathrm{v}}u\|^p_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)} + \|u\|^p_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)} + \|f\|^p_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}\Big)\\
&\overset{(3.15)}{\preceq} ((T-t)\wedge\lambda^{-1})^{p-1}\bigg(\int_t^T \|u_s\|^p_p\mathrm{d}s + \|f\|^p_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}\bigg),\end{aligned}$$

which yields by Gronwall's inequality that

$$\|u_t\|^p_p \leqslant C((T-t)\wedge\lambda^{-1})^{p-1}\|f\|^p_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}. \tag{3.17}$$

Substituting it into (3.15) and (3.16), we obtain (3.7), and also by (3.12),

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \|g^{z^o}_\delta\|^p_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}\mathrm{d}z^o \leqslant C\|f\|^p_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}, \quad t\in[0,T]. \tag{3.18}$$

(c) Let $\alpha\in(0,\frac{2}{3})$. By (3.14), (2.21) and Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|u^{z^o}_{\delta,t}\|_{\alpha,0;p} &\leqslant \int_t^T \mathrm{e}^{\lambda(t-s)}\|P^{z^o}_{t,s}g^{z^o}_{\delta,s}\|_{\alpha,0;p}\mathrm{d}s \preceq \int_t^T \mathrm{e}^{\lambda(t-s)}(s-t)^{-\frac{3\alpha}{2}}\|g^{z^o}_{\delta,s}\|_p\mathrm{d}s\\
&\preceq \bigg(\int_t^T \mathrm{e}^{\lambda(t-s)}(s-t)^{-\frac{3p\alpha}{2(p-1)}}\mathrm{d}s\bigg)^{1-\frac{1}{p}}\|g^{z^o}_\delta\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}\\
&\preceq ((T-t)\wedge\lambda^{-1})^{1-\frac{1}{p}-\frac{3\alpha}{2}}\|g^{z^o}_\delta\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

By (3.9) again, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}u_t\|_p^p=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\|(\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}u_t)\phi_\delta^{z_t^o}\|_p^p\mathrm{d}z^o\leq\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\|\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}u_{\delta,t}^{z_t^o}\|_p^p\mathrm{d}z^o\\+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\|\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}(u_t\phi_\delta^{z_t^o})-(\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}u_t)\phi_\delta^{z_t^o}\|_p^p\mathrm{d}z^o.\end{aligned}\tag{3.20}$$

By (3.19) and (3.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\|\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}u_{\delta,t}^{z^o}\|_p^p\mathrm{d}z^o&\leq((T-t)\wedge\lambda^{-1})^{p-1-\frac{3p\alpha}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\|g_\delta^{z^o}\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}^p\mathrm{d}z^o\\&\leq((T-t)\wedge\lambda^{-1})^{p-1-\frac{3p\alpha}{2}}\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}^p.\end{aligned}\tag{3.21}$$

On the other hand, noticing that by definition (2.1),

$$\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}(u_t\phi_\delta^{z_t^o})-(\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}u_t)\phi_\delta^{z_t^o}=u_t\cdot\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\phi_\delta^{z_t^o}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\delta_{(y,0)}u_t\cdot\delta_{(y,0)}\phi_\delta^{z_t^o}|y|^{-d-\alpha}\mathrm{d}y,$$

and

$$\sup_z\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}|\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\phi_\delta(z_t^o-z)|^p\mathrm{d}z^o\leqslant C_\delta,$$

$$\sup_z\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}|\delta_{(y,0)}\phi_\delta^{z_t^o}(z)|^p\mathrm{d}z^o\right)^{1/p}\leqslant C_\delta(|y|\wedge1),$$

by Minkovskii's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\|\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}(u_t\phi_\delta^{z_t^o})-(\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}u_t)\phi_\delta^{z_t^o}\|_p^p\mathrm{d}z^o&\leq\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\|u_t\cdot\Delta_x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\phi_\delta^{z_t^o}\|_p^p\mathrm{d}z^o\\&+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\delta_{(y,0)}u_t(z)|\cdot\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}|\delta_{(y,0)}\phi_\delta^{z_t^o}(z)|^p\mathrm{d}z^o\right)^{1/p}|y|^{-d-\alpha}\mathrm{d}y\right)^p\mathrm{d}z\\&\leq\|u_t\|_p^p+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\delta_{(y,0)}u_t(z)|\cdot(|y|\wedge1)|y|^{-d-\alpha}\mathrm{d}y\right)^p\mathrm{d}z\\&\leq\|u_t\|_p^p+\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\|\delta_{(y,0)}u_t\|_p\cdot(|y|\wedge1)|y|^{-d-\alpha}\mathrm{d}y\right)^p\leq\|u_t\|_p^p.\end{aligned}\tag{3.22}$$

Combining (3.20), (3.21) and (3.22) with (3.17), we arrive at

$$\|u_t\|_{\alpha,0;p}^p\leq((T-t)\wedge\lambda^{-1})^{p-1-\frac{3p\alpha}{2}}\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}^p.$$

Similarly, for any $\beta\in(0,2)$, one can show that

$$\|u_t\|_{0,\beta;p}^p\leq((T-t)\wedge\lambda^{-1})^{p-1-\frac{p\beta}{2}}\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}^p.$$

Combining the above two estimates, we obtain (3.8).

(d) Below we assume that $u\in\mathbb{H}_p^{0,2}(T)$ is a solution of (3.1) in the sense of Definition 3.1. Let ϱ_ε be defined by (2.15) and set

$$u_\varepsilon:=u*\varrho_\varepsilon,\quad f_\varepsilon:=f*\varrho_\varepsilon.$$

Taking $\varphi = \varrho_\varepsilon(z - \cdot)$ in (3.2), we obtain

$$\partial_t u_\varepsilon + \mathscr{L}_t^a u_\varepsilon - \lambda u_\varepsilon + [\varrho_\varepsilon, \mathscr{L}_t^a] u_t + f_\varepsilon = 0, \ \ u_{\varepsilon,T} = 0,$$

where $\mathscr{L}_t^a := \mathscr{L}_t^{a,0}$ and $[\varrho_\varepsilon, \mathscr{L}_t^a]$ is defined by (2.16). By what we have proved, it holds that

$$\|u_\varepsilon\|_{\mathbb{H}_p^{2/3,2}(T)} \leqslant C_1(\|f_\varepsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} + \|[\varrho_\varepsilon, \mathscr{L}^a]\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)}).$$

Since $\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u \in \mathbb{L}^p(T)$, by the property of convolutions and (ii) of Lemma 2.4, we get (3.7) by taking limits. Similarly, we also have (3.8).

(e) Finally, we use the standard continuity argument to show the existence of a solution (see [20]). Consider the following parametrized equation:

$$\partial_t u + \mathscr{L}_t^{a_\tau} u - \lambda u + f = 0, \ \ u_T = 0, \tag{3.23}$$

where $\tau \in [0,1]$ and $a_\tau := K(1-\tau)\mathbb{I} + \tau a$. Since $K^{-1} \cdot \mathbb{I} \leqslant a \leqslant K \cdot \mathbb{I}$, we obviously have

$$K^{-1} \cdot \mathbb{I} \leqslant a_\tau \leqslant K \cdot \mathbb{I}, \ \ \omega_{a_\tau}(\delta) = \omega_a(\delta).$$

Hence the apriori estimate (3.7) holds for (3.23) with constant C_1 independent of $\tau \in [0,1]$. Suppose that (3.23) is solvable for some $\tau_0 \in [0,1)$. We want to show that (3.23) is also solvable for any $\tau \in [\tau_0, \tau_0 + \frac{1}{4KC_1})$, where C_1 is the constant in (3.7). Let $u^0 = 0$ and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define u^n recursively by

$$\partial_t u^n + \mathscr{L}_t^{a_{\tau_0}} u^n - \lambda u^n + \mathrm{tr}((a_\tau - a_{\tau_0}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u^{n-1}) + f = 0, \ \ u_T^n = 0.$$

By the apriori estimate (3.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u^n\|_{\mathbb{H}_p^{2/3,2}(T)} &\leqslant C_1 \|\mathrm{tr}((a_\tau - a_{\tau_0}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u^{n-1}) + f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} \\
&\leqslant 2KC_1(\tau - \tau_0)\|u^{n-1}\|_{\mathbb{H}_p^{2/3,2}(T)} + C_1\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} \\
&\leqslant \tfrac{1}{2}\|u^{n-1}\|_{\mathbb{H}_p^{2/3,2}(T)} + C_1\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)},
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly,

$$\|u^n - u^m\|_{\mathbb{H}_p^{2/3,2}(T)} \leqslant \tfrac{1}{2}\|u^{n-1} - u^{m-1}\|_{\mathbb{H}_p^{2/3,2}(T)},$$

which imply that u^n is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathbb{H}_p^{2/3,2}(T)$. It is easy to see that the limit u of u^n satisfies (3.23). Since (3.23) is solvable for $\tau = 0$ by (ii) of Theorem 2.5, by repeatedly using what we have proved finitely many times, we get the solvability of (3.23) for $\tau = 1$. □

Next we show further regularity of the solution under extra assumption.

Theorem 3.5. *Suppose that for some $p > 3d/2$, $(\mathbf{H}_K^{\delta,p})$ holds and*

$$\kappa_1 := \sup_{(t,\mathrm{v}) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}} \sigma_t(\cdot, \mathrm{v})\|_p < \infty.$$

(i) For any $f \in \mathbb{H}_p^{2/3,0}(T)$, the unique solution u of PDE (3.1) *also satisfies*

$$\|\nabla_x \nabla_{\mathrm{v}} u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} + \|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}} \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} \leqslant C_3 \|f\|_{\mathbb{H}_p^{2/3,0}(T)}. \tag{3.24}$$

(ii) Let $\alpha \in [0, \frac{2}{3})$ and $\beta \in [0, 2)$. If $p > \frac{2}{(2-3\alpha)(2-\beta)} \vee \frac{3d}{2}$, then

$$\|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}} u_t\|_{\alpha,\beta;p} \leqslant C_4((T-t) \wedge \lambda^{-1})^{1-\frac{1}{p}-\frac{(3\alpha)\vee\beta}{2}} \|f\|_{\mathbb{H}_p^{2/3,0}(T)}. \tag{3.25}$$

Here $C_3 = C_3(d, \delta, K, \kappa_1, p, T)$ and $C_4 = C_4(d, \delta, K, \kappa_1, \alpha, \beta, p, T)$ are increasing with respect to T.

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 3.4, it suffices to show the apriori estimates (3.24) and (3.25). Notice that using (2.11) with $\alpha = \frac{2}{3}, \beta = 2$ and by (3.7),

$$\|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{6}} \nabla_{\mathrm{v}} u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)} \preceq \|u\|_{\mathbb{H}_p^{2/3,2}(t,T)} \preceq \|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)}. \tag{3.26}$$

Assume $u \in C([0,T]; H_p^{\infty,\infty})$ and let $w_t(x, \mathrm{v}) := \Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}} u_t(x, \mathrm{v})$. By (3.1) we have

$$\partial_t w + \mathscr{L}_t^a w + [\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}}, \mathscr{L}_t^a] u + \Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}} f = 0, w_T = 0.$$

By definition (2.1) and the assumptions, it is easy to see that

$$\sup_{(t,\mathrm{v}) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}} a_t(\cdot, \mathrm{v})\|_p < \infty.$$

Hence, by (3.26), (3.7) and (2.13), we have for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\nabla_x \nabla_{\mathrm{v}} u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} + \|\Delta_x^{\frac{2}{3}} u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} + \|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}} \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} \\
&\overset{(2.2)}{\preceq} \|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{6}} \nabla_{\mathrm{v}} w\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} + \|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}} w\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} + \|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 w\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} \\
&\preceq \|[\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}}, \mathscr{L}_t^a] u + \Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}} f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} \\
&\leqslant \|[\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}}, \mathscr{L}_t^a] u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} + \|f\|_{\mathbb{H}_p^{2/3,0}(T)} \\
&\leq \varepsilon \|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}} \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} + C_\varepsilon (\|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} + \|f\|_{\mathbb{H}_p^{2/3,0}(T)}) \\
&\leq \varepsilon \|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}} \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} + C_\varepsilon \|f\|_{\mathbb{H}_p^{2/3,0}(T)},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies the desired estimate (3.24) by letting ε be small enough. As for (3.25), it follows by applying (3.8) to w and using the above estimate. □

3.2. **Proof of Theorem 3.2.** By a standard fixed point argument or Picard's iteration, it suffices to prove the apriori estimate (3.3). Let $\alpha \in (0, \frac{2}{3})$, $\beta \in (1, 2)$ and $p > \frac{2}{(2-3\alpha)\wedge(2-\beta)}$ be not equal to $\frac{d(\alpha+\beta)}{\alpha(\beta-1)}$.

(i) Let $q \in [p \vee \frac{d(\alpha+\beta)}{\alpha(\beta-1)}, \infty]$ and $r \in [p, \infty]$ with $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{r}$. Notice that by Hölder's inequality and (2.11), and using $(\alpha(\beta-1)/\beta, \beta-1)$ in place of (α, β) in (2.12),

$$\|b \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}} u\|^p_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)} \leqslant \int_t^T \|b_s\|_q^p \|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}} u_s\|_r^p \mathrm{d}s \preceq \int_t^T \|b_s\|_q^p \|u_s\|^p_{\alpha,\beta;p} \mathrm{d}s.$$

Thus, by (3.8) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_t\|^p_{\alpha,\beta;p} &\preceq ((T-t) \wedge \lambda^{-1})^{p-1-\frac{p((3\alpha)\vee\beta)}{2}} \|b \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}} u + f\|^p_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)} \\ &\preceq ((T-t) \wedge \lambda^{-1})^{p-1-\frac{p((3\alpha)\vee\beta)}{2}} \|f\|^p_{\mathbb{L}^p(t,T)} + \int_t^T \|b_s\|_q^p \|u_s\|^p_{\alpha,\beta;p} \mathrm{d}s,\end{aligned}$$

which implies (3.4) by Gronwall's inequality.

On the other hand, by (3.7) we have

$$\|u\|^p_{\mathbb{H}^{2/3,0}_p(T)} \preceq \|b \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}} u + f\|^p_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} \preceq \int_0^T \|b_s\|_q^p \|u_s\|^p_{\alpha,\beta;p} \mathrm{d}s + \|f\|^p_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)},$$

which in turn implies (3.3) by (3.4).

(ii) Let $p > \frac{d(3\beta-1)}{2(\beta-1)}$. By Lemma 2.3 with $\alpha = \frac{2}{3}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|b \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}} u\|^p_{\mathbb{H}^{2/3,0}_p(t,T)} &\preceq \int_t^T \|b_s\|^p_{2/3,0;p} \Big(\|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}} \nabla_{\mathrm{v}} u_s\|^p_{0,\beta-1;p} + \|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}} u_s\|^p_{0,\beta-1;p} \Big) \mathrm{d}s \\ &\preceq \int_t^T \|b_s\|^p_{2/3,0;p} \Big(\|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}} u_s\|^p_{0,\beta;p} + \|u_s\|^p_{0,\beta;p} \Big) \mathrm{d}s.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by (3.25) and (3.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}} u_t\|^p_{\alpha,\beta;p} &\preceq ((T-t) \wedge \lambda^{-1})^{p-1-\frac{p((3\alpha)\vee\beta)}{2}} \|b \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}} u + f\|^p_{\mathbb{H}^{2/3,0}_p(t,T)} \\ &\preceq ((T-t) \wedge \lambda^{-1})^{p-1-\frac{p((3\alpha)\vee\beta)}{2}} \|f\|^p_{\mathbb{H}^{2/3,0}_p(t,T)} \\ &\quad + \int_t^T \|b_s\|^p_{2/3,0;p} \|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}} u_s\|^p_{0,\beta;p} \mathrm{d}s,\end{aligned}$$

which yields (3.6) by Gronwall's inequality.

Moreover, by (3.24) we have

$$\|\nabla_x \nabla_{\mathrm{v}} u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} + \|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}} \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2 u\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} \leqslant C \|b \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}} u + f\|_{\mathbb{H}^{2/3,0}_p(T)} \leqslant C \|f\|_{\mathbb{H}^{2/3,0}_p(T)},$$

which gives (3.5). The proof is complete.

4. Well-posedness of martingale problem

Let $\Omega = C(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^{2d})$ be the space of all continuous functions from $\mathbb{R}_+$ to $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$, which is endowed with the locally uniform convergence topology. Let

$$Z_t(\omega) := \omega_t$$

be the coordinate process on Ω. For $t \geqslant 0$, let

$$\mathscr{F}_t := \sigma\Big\{Z_s : s \in [0,t]\Big\}, \ \ \mathscr{F} := \vee_{t\geqslant 0}\mathscr{F}_t.$$

We first recall the following notions of martingale solution and weak solution (see [31]).

Definition 4.1. *Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$ and $b : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be Borel measurable functions and $\mathscr{L}_t^{a,b}$ be defined by* (1.2) *with $a = \frac{1}{2}\sigma\sigma^*$.*

(i) (Martingale solution) For given $(r,z) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, a probability measure $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_{r,z}$ on $(\Omega, \mathscr{F})$ is said a solution to the martingale problem for $\mathscr{L}_t^{a,b}$ starting from (r,z) if

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Z_t = z, t \in [0,r] \text{ and } \int_r^t (\|a_s(Z_s)\| + |b_s(Z_s)|)\mathrm{d}s < \infty, t \geqslant r\right) = 1,$$

and for all $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$[r,\infty) \ni t \mapsto \varphi(Z_t) - \int_r^t \mathscr{L}_s^{a,b}\varphi(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s =: M_t^{r,\varphi} \tag{4.1}$$

is an $\mathscr{F}_t$-martingale with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ after time r. We denote by $\mathscr{P}_{r,z}^{\sigma,b}$ the set of all martingale solutions associated with (σ, b) and starting from (r,z).

(ii) (Well-posedness) One says that the martingale problem for $\mathscr{L}_t^{a,b}$ is well-posed if for each $(r,z) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, there is exactly one solution $\mathbb{P}_{r,z}$ to the martingale problem for $\mathscr{L}_t^{a,b}$ starting from (r,z).

(iii) (Weak solution) A triple $((\tilde{Z}, \tilde{W}); (\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathscr{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}}); (\tilde{\mathscr{F}}_t)_{t\geqslant 0})$ is called a weak solution of SDE (1.1) *with starting point $(r,z) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ if $(\tilde{\mathscr{F}}_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ satisfies the usual conditions, $\tilde{W}$ is a d-dimensional $\tilde{\mathscr{F}}_t$-Brownian motion, and $\tilde{Z} = (\tilde{X}, \dot{\tilde{X}})$ is an $\tilde{\mathscr{F}}_t$-adapted $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$-valued process satisfying that*

$$\int_r^t (\|a_s(\tilde{Z}_s)\| + |b_s(\tilde{Z}_s)|)\mathrm{d}s < \infty, \ t \geqslant r, \ \ \tilde{\mathbb{P}} - a.s.,$$

and

$$\tilde{Z}_t = z + \int_r^t (\dot{\tilde{X}}_s, b_s(\tilde{Z}_s))\mathrm{d}s + \int_r^t (0, \sigma_s(\tilde{Z}_s)\mathrm{d}\tilde{W}_s).$$

Remark 4.2. *It is well known that the martingale solutions and weak solutions are equivalent, for example, see* [18, p.318, Proposition 4.11].

4.1. **Krylov's type estimate.** In this subsection we first show the following important estimate of Krylov's type for weak solutions.

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose that σ satisfies* **(UE)** *and*

$$\lim_{|z-z'|\to 0} \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|\sigma_t(z) - \sigma_t(z')\| = 0, \ T > 0, \tag{4.2}$$

and $b \in \cap_T \mathbb{L}^q(T)$ *for some* $q > (2(2d+1), \infty]$. *Then for any* $p > 2d+1$ *and* $T > 0$, *there is a constant* $C > 0$ *depending on* $T, \sigma, p, q, d, \|b\|_{\mathbb{L}^q(T)}$ *such that for any* $(r, z) \in [0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, *any weak solution* $((\tilde{Z}, \tilde{W}); (\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathscr{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}}); (\tilde{\mathscr{F}}_t)_{t \geqslant 0})$ *of SDE* (1.1) *with starting point* (r, z), *and* $r \leqslant t_0 < t_1 \leqslant T$ *and* $f \in \mathbb{L}^p(T)$,

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left(\int_{t_0}^{t_1} f_s(\tilde{Z}_s)\mathrm{d}s \Big| \tilde{\mathscr{F}}_{t_0}\right) \leqslant C(t_1 - t_0)^{\frac{1}{2d+1} - \frac{1}{p}} \|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t_0, t_1)}, \tag{4.3}$$

where $C > 0$ *is increasing in* $T, \omega_\sigma(\delta)$ *and* $\|b\|_{\mathbb{L}^q(T)}$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume $(r, z) = (0, 0)$ and drop the tilde in the definition of weak solutions for simplicity. We divide the proof into four steps.

(a) Let $a_t(z) := \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_t \sigma_t^*)(z)$ and $p \in (2(2d+1), q]$. For any $0 \leqslant t_0 < t_1 \leqslant T$, $\lambda \geqslant 1$ and $f \in \mathbb{L}^p(t_0, t_1)$, let $u = \mathcal{R}^{a,b}_{\lambda, t_1}(f)$ be the solution of PDE (3.1) with terminal time $T = t_1$. By (2.12) and (3.4) with $\alpha = \frac{4d}{3(2d+1)}$ and $\beta = \frac{4d}{2d+1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{R}^{a,b}_{\lambda, t_1}(f)\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(t_0, t_1)} &\leq \left\|\mathcal{R}^{a,b}_{\lambda, t_1}(f)\right\|_{L^\infty([t_0, t_1]; H_p^{\alpha, \beta})} \\ &\leq ((t_1 - t_0) \wedge \lambda^{-1})^{\frac{1}{2d+1} - \frac{1}{p}} \|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t_0, t_1)}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

and by (2.11), (2.12), (3.4) with $\alpha = \frac{4d+1}{3(2d+1)}$ and $\beta = \frac{4d+1}{2d+1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{R}^{a,0}_{\lambda, t_1}(f)\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(t_0, t_1)} &\leq \left\|\mathcal{R}^{a,0}_{\lambda, t_1}(f)\right\|_{L^\infty([t_0, t_1]; H_p^{\alpha, \beta})} \\ &\leq ((t_1 - t_0) \wedge \lambda^{-1})^{\frac{1}{2(2d+1)} - \frac{1}{p}} \|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t_0, t_1)}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

where the C in the above $\leq$ only depend on $d, p, q, K, T, \omega_a(\delta)$ and $\|b\|_{\mathbb{L}^q(T)}$.

Now, for any $R > 0$, define a stopping time

$$\tau_R := \left\{t \geqslant 0 : \int_0^t |b_s(Z_s)|\mathrm{d}s > R\right\}. \tag{4.6}$$

Let ϱ_ε be as in (2.15). We introduce a $d \times d$ matrix-valued function, which is crucial for us below. For $t \geqslant 0$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, let

$$a_t^{\varepsilon, R}(z) := \begin{cases} \frac{\mathbb{E}\left(a_t(Z_t)\varrho_\varepsilon(Z_t - z)1_{t < \tau_R}\right)}{\mathbb{E}\left(\varrho_\varepsilon(Z_t - z)1_{t < \tau_R}\right)}, & \text{if } \mathbb{E}(\varrho_\varepsilon(Z_t - z)1_{t < \tau_R}) \neq 0, \\ a_t(z), & \text{if } \mathbb{E}(\varrho_\varepsilon(Z_t - z)1_{t < \tau_R}) = 0. \end{cases}$$

By **(UE)** and the definitions, we have

$$K^{-2} \cdot \mathbb{I} \leqslant a_t^{\varepsilon, R}(z) \leqslant K^2 \cdot \mathbb{I},$$

and for all $|z - z'| \leqslant \varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|a_t^{\varepsilon, R}(z) - a_t^{\varepsilon, R}(z')\| &\leqslant \|a_t(z) - a_t(z')\| + \left\|\frac{\mathbb{E}\left((a_t(Z_t) - a_t(z))\varrho_\varepsilon(Z_t - z)1_{t < \tau_R}\right)}{\mathbb{E}\left(\varrho_\varepsilon(Z_t - z)1_{t < \tau_R}\right)}\right\| \\ &\quad + \left\|\frac{\mathbb{E}\left((a_t(Z_t) - a_t(z'))\varrho_\varepsilon(Z_t - z')1_{t < \tau_R}\right)}{\mathbb{E}\left(\varrho_\varepsilon(Z_t - z)1_{t < \tau_R}\right)}\right\| \leqslant 3\omega_a(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Let C_0 be the same as in (2.22). By (4.2), one may choose δ_0 small enough such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta_0)$ and $R > 0$,

$$\omega_{a^{\varepsilon,R}}(\varepsilon) \leqslant 3\omega_a(\delta_0) \leqslant \tfrac{1}{2(C_0+1)}. \tag{4.7}$$

(b) In this step we show that for any $p > 2(2d+1)$ and $f \in \mathbb{L}^p(T)$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^T f_s(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\right) \leqslant C\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)}. \tag{4.8}$$

By a standard density argument, we may assume $f \in C_c([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d})$. Let

$$u^{\varepsilon,R} := \mathcal{R}^{a^{\varepsilon,R},0}_{\lambda,T}(f), \quad u^{\varepsilon,R}_\varepsilon := u^{\varepsilon,R} * \varrho_\varepsilon, \quad f_\varepsilon := f * \varrho_\varepsilon.$$

By Itô's formula, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(u^{\varepsilon,R}_{\varepsilon,T\wedge\tau_R}(Z_{T\wedge\tau_R}) - u_{\varepsilon,0}(Z_0)\Big) = \mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R}(\partial_s u^{\varepsilon,R}_{\varepsilon,s} + \mathscr{L}^{a,b}_s u^{\varepsilon,R}_{\varepsilon,s})(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\right). \tag{4.9}$$

Noticing that by Definition 3.1,

$$\partial_s u^{\varepsilon,R}_{\varepsilon,s} + (\mathscr{L}^{a^{\varepsilon,R},0}_s u^{\varepsilon,R}_s) * \varrho_\varepsilon - \lambda u^{\varepsilon,R}_{\varepsilon,s} + f_\varepsilon = 0,$$

and by the definitions of $u^{\varepsilon,R}_\varepsilon$ and $a^{\varepsilon,R}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}(\mathrm{tr}(a_s\cdot\nabla^2_{\mathrm{v}} u^{\varepsilon,R}_{\varepsilon,t})(Z_s)1_{s<\tau_R})\\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \mathbb{E}(\mathrm{tr}(a_s(Z_s)\cdot\nabla^2_{\mathrm{v}} u^{\varepsilon,R}_s(z))\varrho_\varepsilon(Z_s - z)1_{s<\tau_R})\mathrm{d}z\\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \mathrm{tr}(a^{\varepsilon,R}_s(z)\cdot\nabla^2_{\mathrm{v}} u^{\varepsilon,R}_s(z))\mathbb{E}(\varrho_\varepsilon(Z_s - z)1_{s<\tau_R})\mathrm{d}z\\
&= \mathbb{E}\Big((\mathrm{tr}(a^{\varepsilon,R}_s\cdot\nabla^2_{\mathrm{v}} u^{\varepsilon,R}_s) * \varrho_\varepsilon)(Z_s)1_{s<\tau_R}\Big),
\end{aligned}$$

by easy calculations, one sees that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\Big((\partial_s u^{\varepsilon,R}_{\varepsilon,t} + \mathscr{L}^{a,b}_s u^{\varepsilon,R}_{\varepsilon,t})(Z_s)1_{s<\tau_R}\Big)\\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \mathbb{E}\Big((\dot{X}_s - \mathrm{v})\cdot\nabla_x\varrho_\varepsilon(Z_s - z)1_{s<\tau_R}\Big)u^{\varepsilon,R}_s(z)\mathrm{d}z\\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}\Big((b_s\cdot\nabla_{\mathrm{v}} u^{\varepsilon,R}_{\varepsilon,t} + \lambda u^{\varepsilon,R}_s - f_\varepsilon)(Z_s)1_{s<\tau_R}\Big)\\
&\leqslant \|u^{\varepsilon,R}_s\|_\infty\left(\lambda + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |\mathrm{v}|\,|\nabla_x\varrho_\varepsilon|(x,\mathrm{v})\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}\mathrm{v}\right)\\
&\quad + \|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}} u^{\varepsilon,R}_s\|_\infty\mathbb{E}(|b_s|(Z_s)1_{s<\tau_R}) - \mathbb{E}(f_\varepsilon(Z_s)1_{s<\tau_R}).
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting this into (4.9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R} f_\varepsilon(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\right) &\leqslant (\|\nabla_x\varrho\|_1 + 2 + \lambda)\|u^{\varepsilon,R}\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(T)}\\
&\quad + \|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}} u^{\varepsilon,R}\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(T)}\mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R}|b_s|(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\right).
\end{aligned}$$

By (4.7), (4.4) and (4.5) with $b \equiv 0$, there is a $C = C(d, p, K, T, \omega_a(\delta_0)) > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta_0)$ and $\lambda > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\bigg(\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R} f_{\varepsilon,s}(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\bigg) &\leqslant C(1+\lambda)T^{\frac{1}{2d+1}-\frac{1}{p}}\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)}\\ &\quad + C\lambda^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2(2d+1)}}\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)}\mathbb{E}\bigg(\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R}|b_s|(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\bigg),\end{aligned}$$

which implies, by letting $\varepsilon \to 0$ and λ large enough, that for any $\delta > 0$, there is a $C_\delta > 0$ such that for all $f \in \mathbb{L}^p(T)$,

$$\mathbb{E}\bigg(\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R} f_s(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\bigg) \leqslant \bigg(C_\delta + \delta\mathbb{E}\bigg(\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R}|b_s|(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\bigg)\bigg)\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)}. \tag{4.10}$$

In particular, choosing $f_s = |b_s|$ and $\delta \leqslant 1/(2\|b\|_{\mathbb{L}^q(T)})$, we get

$$\mathbb{E}\bigg(\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R}|b_s|(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\bigg) \leqslant C\|b\|_{\mathbb{L}^q(T)}.$$

Substituting this into (4.10) and letting $R \to \infty$, we get (4.8).

(c) In this step we show that (4.3) holds for $p = q > 2(2d+1)$. Let $0 \leqslant t_0 < t_1 \leqslant T$ and $f \in \mathbb{L}^q(t_0, t_1)$, and write

$$u := -\mathcal{R}^{a,b}_{0,t_1}(f) \in \mathbb{H}^{0,2}_q(t_1), \quad u_\varepsilon := u * \varrho_\varepsilon.$$

Noticing that by definitions,

$$\partial_t u_{\varepsilon,t} + \mathscr{L}^{a,b}_t u_{\varepsilon,t} = f_{\varepsilon,t} + [\varrho_\varepsilon, \mathscr{L}^{a,b}_t]u_t, \quad u_{\varepsilon,t_1} = 0,$$

by Itô's formula, we have

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathscr{F}_{t_0}}\Big(u_{\varepsilon,t_1}(Z_{t_1}) - u_{\varepsilon,t_0}(Z_{t_0})\Big) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathscr{F}_{t_0}}\bigg(\int_{t_0}^{t_1}\Big(f_{\varepsilon,s} + [\varrho_\varepsilon, \mathscr{L}^{a,b}_s]u_s\Big)(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\bigg), \tag{4.11}$$

where $\mathbb{E}^{\mathscr{F}_{t_0}}(\cdot) = \mathbb{E}(\cdot|^{\mathscr{F}_{t_0}})$. Since by (4.8), (4.5) and Lemma 2.4,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\mathbb{E}\bigg(\int_{t_0}^{t_1}|[\varrho_\varepsilon, \mathscr{L}^{a,b}_s]u_s|(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\bigg) \preceq \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\|[\varrho_\varepsilon, \mathscr{L}^{a,b}_\cdot]u\|_{\mathbb{L}^q(t_0,t_1)} = 0$$

and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\mathbb{E}\bigg(\int_{t_0}^{t_1}|f_{\varepsilon,s} - f_s|(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\bigg) \preceq \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\|f_\varepsilon - f\|_{\mathbb{L}^q(t_0,t_1)} = 0,$$

taking limits $\varepsilon \to 0$ for both sides of (4.11) and by (4.4), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathscr{F}_{t_0}}\bigg(\int_{t_0}^{t_1} f_s(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\bigg) \leqslant 2\|u\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(t_0,t_1)} \leqslant C(t_1-t_0)^{\frac{1}{2d+1}-\frac{1}{q}}\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^q(t_0,t_1)}. \tag{4.12}$$

(d) Let $0 \leqslant t_0 < t_1 \leqslant T$. By (4.12) with $f_s = |b_s|$ and Corollary 4.4 below, we have for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathscr{F}_{t_0}}\exp\bigg(\lambda\int_{t_0}^{t_1}|b_s(Z_s)|\mathrm{d}s\bigg) \leqslant C(\lambda, \|b\|_{\mathbb{L}^q(T)}) < \infty. \tag{4.13}$$

Define

$$\mathcal{E}_{t_0,t_1} := \exp\left\{\int_{t_0}^{t_1}(\sigma_s^{-1}b_s)(Z_s)\mathrm{d}W_s - \frac{1}{2}\int_{t_0}^{t_1}|(\sigma_s^{-1}b_s)(Z_s)|^2\mathrm{d}s\right\}.$$

By Novikov's criterion, $\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}_{t_0,t_1}) = 1$, and for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, by (4.13) and Hölder's inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\mathcal{E}^{\gamma}_{t_0,t_1}|\mathscr{F}_{t_0}\Big) < \infty. \tag{4.14}$$

Define a new probability $\mathbb{Q}_{t_0,t_1} := \mathcal{E}_{t_0,t_1}\mathbb{P}$. By Girsanov's theorem, $\bar{W}_\cdot := W_\cdot + \int_{t_0}^{\cdot} b_s(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s$ is still a Brownian motion under $\mathbb{Q}_{t_0,t_1}$. Moreover, Z_t satisfies

$$Z_t = Z_{t_0} + \int_{t_0}^{t}(\dot{X}_s, 0)\mathrm{d}s + \int_{t_0}^{t}(0, \sigma_s(Z_s)\mathrm{d}\bar{W}_s).$$

By the same argument as used in **(c)** with $b \equiv 0$, since in this case, we only need to control $\|u\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(t_0,t_1)}$ and (4.4) holds for any $p > 2d+1$, we obtain that there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $p > 2d+1$ and $f \in \mathbb{L}^p(T)$,

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_{t_0,t_1}}\left(\int_{t_0}^{t_1} f_s(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\Big|\mathscr{F}_{t_0}\right) \leqslant C(t_1-t_0)^{\frac{1}{2d+1}-\frac{1}{p}}\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t_0,t_1)}.$$

Finally, by (4.14) and Hölder's inequality, we obtain (4.3). □

We have the following useful corollary.

Corollary 4.4. *(Khasminskii's type estimate) In the same framework of Theorem 4.3, letting* $\beta := \frac{1}{2d+1} - \frac{1}{p}$ *and* C *be the same as in* (4.3)*, we have*

(i) For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ *and* $0 \leqslant t_0 < t_1 \leqslant T$*, it holds that*

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}^{\tilde{\mathscr{F}}_{t_0}}\left(\int_{t_0}^{t_1} f_s(\tilde{Z}_s)\mathrm{d}s\right)^m \leqslant m!(C\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)}(t_1-t_0)^\beta)^m,$$

where $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}^{\tilde{\mathscr{F}}_{t_0}}(\cdot) = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}(\cdot|^{\tilde{\mathscr{F}}_{t_0}})$.

(ii) For any $\lambda > 0$ *and* $0 \leqslant t_0 < t_1 \leqslant T$*, it holds that*

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}^{\tilde{\mathscr{F}}_{t_0}}\exp\left(\lambda\int_{t_0}^{t_1} f_s(\tilde{Z}_s)\mathrm{d}s\right) \leqslant 2^{T(2C\lambda\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)})^{1/\beta}}.$$

Proof. (i) Still we drop the tilde below. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, noticing that

$$\left(\int_{t_0}^{t_1} g(s)\mathrm{d}s\right)^m = m!\int\cdots\int_{\Delta^m} g(s_1)\cdots g(s_m)\mathrm{d}s_1\cdots\mathrm{d}s_m,$$

where

$$\Delta^m := \Big\{(s_1,\cdots,s_m) : t_0 \leqslant s_1 \leqslant s_2 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant s_m \leqslant t_1\Big\},$$

by (4.3), we have

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathscr{F}_{t_0}}\left(\int_{t_0}^{t_1} f_s(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\right)^m = m!\mathbb{E}^{\mathscr{F}_{t_0}}\left(\int\cdots\int_{\Delta^m} f_{s_1}(Z_{s_1})\cdots f_{s_m}(Z_{s_m})\mathrm{d}s_1\cdots\mathrm{d}s_m\right)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= m!\mathbb{E}^{\mathscr{F}_{t_0}}\bigg(\int\cdots\int_{\Delta^{m-1}} f_{s_1}(Z_{s_1})\cdots f_{s_{m-1}}(Z_{s_{m-1}})\\
&\quad\times\mathbb{E}\bigg(\int_{s_{m-1}}^{t_1} f_{s_m}(Z_{s_m})\mathrm{d}s_m\Big|_{\mathscr{F}_{s_{m-1}}}\bigg)\mathrm{d}s_1\cdots\mathrm{d}s_{m-1}\bigg)\\
&\leqslant m!\mathbb{E}^{\mathscr{F}_{t_0}}\int\cdots\int_{\Delta^{m-1}} f_{s_1}(Z_{s_1})\cdots f_{s_{m-1}}(Z_{s_{m-1}})\\
&\quad\times C(t_1-s_{m-1})^{\beta}\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)}\mathrm{d}s_1\cdots\mathrm{d}s_{m-1}\leqslant\cdots\\
&\leqslant m!(C\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)}(t_1-t_0)^{\beta})^m.
\end{aligned}
$$

(ii) For $\lambda>0$, let us choose n such that for $s_j=t_0+\frac{j(t_1-t_0)}{n}$,

$$
\lambda C\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)}(s_{j+1}-s_j)^{\beta}\leqslant 1/2.
$$

Then by (i) we have

$$
\mathbb{E}^{\mathscr{F}_{s_j}}\exp\bigg(\lambda\int_{s_j}^{s_{j+1}} f_s(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\bigg)=\sum_m\frac{1}{m!}\mathbb{E}^{\mathscr{F}_{s_j}}\bigg(\lambda\int_{s_j}^{s_{j+1}} f_s(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\bigg)^m\leqslant 2.
$$

Hence,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}^{\mathscr{F}_{t_0}}\exp\bigg(\lambda\int_{t_0}^{t_1} f_s(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\bigg)=\mathbb{E}^{\mathscr{F}_{t_0}}\bigg(\prod_{j=0}^{n-1}\exp\bigg(\lambda\int_{s_j}^{s_{j+1}} f_s(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\bigg)\bigg)\\
&=\mathbb{E}^{\mathscr{F}_{t_0}}\bigg(\prod_{j=0}^{n-2}\exp\bigg(\lambda\int_{s_j}^{s_{j+1}} f_s(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\bigg)\mathbb{E}^{\mathscr{F}_{s_{n-1}}}\exp\bigg(\lambda\int_{s_{n-1}}^{s_n} f_s(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\bigg)\bigg)\\
&\leqslant 2\mathbb{E}^{\mathscr{F}_{t_0}}\bigg(\prod_{j=0}^{n-2}\exp\bigg(\lambda\int_{s_j}^{s_{j+1}} f_s(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\bigg)\bigg)\leqslant\cdots\leqslant 2^n.
\end{aligned}
$$

The proof is complete. □

4.2. **Well-posedness of martingale problem.** In this subsection we show the well-posedness of martingale problem for $\mathscr{L}_t^{a,b}$. More precisely,

Theorem 4.5. *Suppose that* **(UE)** *holds, and for any $T>0$,*

$$
\lim_{|z-z'|\to 0}\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|\sigma_t(z)-\sigma_t(z')\|=0, \tag{4.15}
$$

and $b\in\mathbb{L}^q(T)$ for some $q\in(2(2d+1),\infty]$. For each $(r,z)\in\mathbb{R}_+\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}$, the set $\mathscr{P}_{r,z}^{\sigma,b}$ has one and only one point. In particular, the martingale problem for $\mathscr{L}_t^{a,b}$ is well-posed.

Proof. Below, we shall fix starting point $(r,z)\in\mathbb{R}_+\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and divide the proof into three steps.

(a) We first show the uniqueness. For $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ and $t_1 > r$, let $u = \mathcal{R}^{a,b}_{0,t_1}(\varphi) \in \mathbb{H}^{2/3,2}_p(t_1)$, which satisfies

$$\partial_t u + \mathscr{L}_t^{a,b} u + \varphi = 0, \ \ u_{t_1} = 0. \tag{4.16}$$

Let $u_t^\varepsilon(z) := u_t * \varrho_\varepsilon(z)$ and $\mathbb{P} \in \mathscr{P}^{\sigma,b}_{r,z}$. By (4.1), (4.3) and a standard approximation for the time variable, one sees that

$$t \mapsto u^\varepsilon(t, Z_t) - \int_r^t (\partial_s + \mathscr{L}_s^{a,b}) u^\varepsilon(s, Z_s) \mathrm{d}s$$

is an $\mathscr{F}_t$-martingale under $\mathbb{P}$ after time r. Thus, by (4.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_r^\varepsilon(z) &= -\mathbb{E}\bigg(\int_r^{t_1} (\partial_s u + \mathscr{L}_s^{a,b}) u_s^\varepsilon(Z_s) \mathrm{d}s\bigg) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\bigg(\int_r^{t_1} ([\varrho_\varepsilon, \mathscr{L}_s^{a,b}] u_s + \varphi^\varepsilon)(Z_s) \mathrm{d}s\bigg). \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 4.3 and Lemma 2.4, taking limits $\varepsilon \to 0$ for both sides yields

$$u_r(z) = \mathbb{E}\bigg(\int_r^{t_1} \varphi(Z_s) \mathrm{d}s\bigg), \ t_1 \geqslant r.$$

In particular, we have for any $\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2 \in \mathscr{P}^{\sigma,b}_{r,z}$ and $t \geqslant r$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_1} \varphi(Z_t) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_2} \varphi(Z_t).$$

By [31, Theorem 6.2.3], we get the uniqueness.

(b) For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\varrho_{1/n}$ be defined by (2.15) with $\varepsilon = 1/n$, and define

$$b_t^n := b_t * \varrho_{1/n}, \ \sigma_t^n := \sigma_t * \varrho_{1/n}.$$

Clearly,

$$b^n \in L^q([0,T]; C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d})), \ \sigma^n \in L^\infty([0,T]; C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d}))$$

and

$$\|b^n\|_{\mathbb{L}^q(T)} \leqslant \|b\|_{\mathbb{L}^q(T)}, \ \omega_{a^n}(\delta) \leqslant \omega_a(\delta).$$

By the classical theory of SDEs, the following SDE admits a unique strong solution $Z_t^n = (X_t^n, \dot{X}_t^n)$

$$\mathrm{d}Z_t^n = (\dot{X}_t^n, b_t^n(Z_t^n))\mathrm{d}t + (0, \sigma_t^n(Z_t^n)\mathrm{d}W_t), \ Z_t^n|_{[0,r]} = z.$$

By Corollary 4.4, for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $T > 0$, there is a constant $C = C(m,T) > 0$ such that for all $r \leqslant t_0 < t_1 \leqslant T$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\bigg|\int_{t_0}^{t_1} b_s^n(Z_s^n) \mathrm{d}s\bigg|^m \leqslant C\|b\|^m_{\mathbb{L}^q(T)} (t_1 - t_0)^{m(\frac{1}{2d+1} - \frac{1}{p})}.$$

Let $\mathbb{P}_n$ be the probability distribution of Z^n in Ω. By the above moment estimate, it is by now standard to show that $(\mathbb{P}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is tight.

(c) By extracting a subsequence, without loss of generality, we may assume that $\mathbb{P}_n$ weakly converges to some probability measure $\mathbb{P}$. To see that

$\mathbb{P} \in \mathscr{P}^{\sigma,b}_{r,z}$, it suffices to show that for any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, $M_t^{r,\varphi}$ defined by (4.1) is an $\mathscr{F}_t$-martingale under $\mathbb{P}$. Equivalently, for any $r \leqslant t_0 \leqslant t_1$ and any bounded continuous $\mathscr{F}_{t_0}$-measurable G,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(M^{r,\varphi}_{t_1} G) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(M^{r,\varphi}_{t_0} G). \tag{4.17}$$

Notice that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_n}(M^{r,\varphi}_{n,t_1} G) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_n}(M^{r,\varphi}_{n,t_0} G), \tag{4.18}$$

where

$$M^{r,\varphi}_{n,t_i} := \varphi(Z_{t_i}) - \int_r^{t_i} \mathscr{L}_s^{a^n,b^n}\varphi(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s,\ i = 0, 1.$$

Let us prove the following limit: for $i = 0, 1$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_n}\left(G\int_r^{t_i} (b^n_s \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}\varphi)(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\right) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left(G\int_r^{t_i} (b_s \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}\varphi)(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\right). \tag{4.19}$$

For any $p \in (2d+1, q)$ and $T > 0$, by Theorem 4.3, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in \mathbb{L}^p(T)$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_n}\left(\int_r^T f_s(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\right) \leqslant C\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)}.$$

Let $f \in C_c([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d})$. By taking weak limits, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\int_r^T f_s(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\right) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_n}\left(\int_r^T f_s(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\right) \leqslant C\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)}.$$

By a monotone class argument, the above estimate still holds for all $f \in \mathbb{L}^p(T)$. Let the support of φ be contained in B_R. Thus, if we let $\mathbb{P}_\infty = \mathbb{P}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{m\to\infty} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{\infty\}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_n}\left(G\int_r^{t_i} |(b^m_s - b_s)\cdot\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}\varphi|(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\right)\\ \leqslant C\|G\|_\infty\|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}\varphi\|_\infty \lim_{m\to\infty}\|(b^m - b)1_{B_R}\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(r,t_i)} = 0.\end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

On the other hand, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, since $\omega \mapsto G(\omega)\int_r^{t_i}(b^m_s\cdot\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}\varphi)(Z_s(\omega))\mathrm{d}s$ is a continuous and bounded functional, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_n}\left(G\int_r^{t_i} (b^m_s \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}\varphi)(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\right) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left(G\int_r^{t_i} (b^m_s \cdot \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}\varphi)(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\right).$$

Combining this with (4.20), we get (4.19). Similarly, one can show

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_n}\left(G\int_r^{t_i} \mathscr{L}_r^{a^n,0}\varphi(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\right) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left(G\int_r^{t_i} \mathscr{L}_r^{a,0}\varphi(Z_s)\mathrm{d}s\right). \tag{4.21}$$

Finally, by taking weak limits for both sides of (4.18) and using (4.19) and (4.21), we get (4.17). The proof is complete. □

Remark 4.6. *When b is bounded measurable ($q = \infty$), this result has been proven in* [27] *and* [23]*. Therein, more general equations were considered. However, by comparing with the original proof of Stroock and Varadhan* [31, Chapter 7]*, our proof is quite different from* [27, 23] *as our starting point is a global apriori Krylov's estimate (see Theorem 4.3). In principle, it is reasonable to believe that our argument is applicable for more general equations as studied in* [27, 23].

Remark 4.7. *By suitable localization techniques as developed in* [27]*, it is possible to weaken the global assumptions in Theorem 4.5 as local ones together with some non-explosion conditions.*

4.3. **Proof of Theorem 1.3.** Let $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$. By Theorem 4.5, the probability measure $\mathbb{P}_\nu(A) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \mathbb{P}_{0,z}(A)\nu(\mathrm{d}z)$ is the unique martingale solution for $\mathscr{L}_t^{a,b}$ starting from ν at time 0. The conclusion of Theorem 1.3 now follows by [33, Theorem 2.5].

5. Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section we assume that σ satisfies **(UE)** and for some $p > 2(2d+1)$,

$$\kappa_0 := \|b\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}_+;H_p^{2/3,0})} + \|\nabla\sigma\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+;L^p)} < \infty. \tag{5.1}$$

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\varrho_{1/n}$ be defined by (2.15) with $\varepsilon = 1/n$, as in the previous, define

$$b_t^n := b_t * \varrho_{1/n},\ \sigma_t^n := \sigma_t * \varrho_{1/n},\ \ b_t^\infty := b_t,\ \sigma_t^\infty := \sigma_t. \tag{5.2}$$

Lemma 5.1. *Assume* **(UE)** *and* (5.1)*. Then* $(\mathbf{H}_K^{\delta,p})$ *holds for $a^n := \frac{1}{2}\sigma^n(\sigma^n)^*$ uniformly with respect to n, and there exists a constant $C = C(d,p) > 0$ such that for all s,*

$$\|\sigma_s^n - \sigma_s\|_\infty \leqslant C\|\nabla\sigma_s\|_p n^{\frac{2d}{p}-1},\ \ \sup_{\mathrm{v}} \|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}}\sigma_s^n(\cdot,\mathrm{v})\|_p \leqslant C\|\nabla\sigma_s\|_p.$$

Proof. Since $p > 2d$, by Morrey's inequality, there is a constant $C = C(d,p) > 0$ such that

$$|\sigma_s(z) - \sigma_s(z')| \leqslant C|z - z'|^{1-\frac{2d}{p}}\|\nabla\sigma_s\|_p,\ \ z, z' \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}.$$

From this, it is easy to see that $(\mathbf{H}_K^{\delta,p})$ holds for $a^n = \frac{1}{2}\sigma^n(\sigma^n)^*$ uniformly with respect to n, and

$$\begin{aligned}\|\sigma_s^n - \sigma_s\|_\infty &\leqslant \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \|\sigma_s(\cdot + z) - \sigma_s(\cdot)\|_\infty \varrho_{1/n}(z)\mathrm{d}z \\ &\leqslant C\|\nabla\sigma_s\|_p \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |z|^{1-\frac{2d}{p}}\varrho_{1/n}(z)\mathrm{d}z \leqslant C\|\nabla\sigma_s\|_p n^{\frac{2d}{p}-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since $p > 4d$, by (2.7) and (2.10), we have

$$\sup_{\mathrm{v}} \|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}}\sigma_s^n(\cdot,\mathrm{v})\|_p^p \leqslant \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sup_{\mathrm{v}} |\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}}\sigma_s^n(x,\mathrm{v})|_p^p \mathrm{d}x \preceq \|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}}\sigma_s^n\|_p^p + \|\Delta_x^{\frac{1}{3}}\Delta_{\mathrm{v}}^{\frac{1}{8}}\sigma_s^n\|_p^p$$
$$\preceq \|\Delta^{\frac{11}{24}}\sigma_s^n\|_p^p \preceq \|\Delta^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma_s^n\|_p^p \overset{(2.2)}{\preceq} \|\nabla\sigma_s^n\|_p^p.$$

Here $\Delta = \Delta_x + \Delta_{\mathrm{v}}$. The proof is complete. □

Let $T > 0$ and $\lambda \geqslant 1$. For $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, let $\mathbf{u}_\lambda^n \in \mathbb{H}_p^{0,2}(T)$ uniquely solve the following PDE:

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u}_\lambda^n + \mathscr{L}_t^{a^n,b^n}\mathbf{u}_\lambda^n - \lambda\mathbf{u}_\lambda^n + b^n = 0, \quad \mathbf{u}_{\lambda,T}^n = 0,$$

where $a^n := \frac{1}{2}\sigma^n(\sigma^n)^*$. By Lemma 5.1 and Theorem 3.2, there is a constant $C = C(d,p,\kappa_0,K) > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$,

$$\|\nabla\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}\mathbf{u}_\lambda^n\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} \leqslant C\|b\|_{\mathbb{H}_p^{2/3,0}(T)}, \tag{5.3}$$

and by (2.11), (2.12), (3.4) with $\alpha = \frac{4d+1}{3(2d+1)}$ and $\beta = \frac{4d+1}{2d+1}$,

$$\|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}\mathbf{u}_\lambda^n\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(T)} \leqslant C\|\mathbf{u}_\lambda^n\|_{L^\infty(0,T;\mathbb{H}_p^{\alpha,\beta})} \leqslant C(T\wedge\lambda^{-1})^{\frac{1}{2(2d+1)}-\frac{1}{p}}\|b\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)}. \tag{5.4}$$

Lemma 5.2. *Under* **(UE)** *and* (5.1)*, there is a constant $C > 0$ depending only on $d, p, \kappa_0, K, T, \lambda$ such that for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\|\mathbf{u}_\lambda^n - \mathbf{u}_\lambda^m\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(T)} + \|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}\mathbf{u}_\lambda^n - \nabla_{\mathrm{v}}\mathbf{u}_\lambda^m\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(T)} \leqslant C\Big(\|b^n - b^m\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} + (n\wedge m)^{\frac{2d}{p}-1}\Big).$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{w}^{n,m} := \mathbf{u}_\lambda^n - \mathbf{u}_\lambda^m$. By equation (3.1), we have

$$\partial_t\mathbf{w}^{n,m} + (\mathscr{L}_t^{a^n,b^n} - \lambda)\mathbf{w}^{n,m} + (\mathscr{L}_t^{a^n,b^n} - \mathscr{L}_t^{a^m,b^m})\mathbf{u}_\lambda^m + b^n - b^m = 0.$$

Noticing that

$$g_{\lambda,t}^{n,m} := (\mathscr{L}_t^{a^n,b^n} - \mathscr{L}_t^{\sigma^m,b^m})\mathbf{u}_{\lambda,t}^m = \mathrm{tr}((a_t^n - a_t^m)\cdot\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2\mathbf{u}_{\lambda,t}^m) + (b_t^n - b_t^m)\cdot\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}\mathbf{u}_{\lambda,t}^m,$$

by (5.3), (5.4) and Lemma 5.1, we have

$$\|g_\lambda^{n,m}\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} \preceq \|a^n - a^m\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(T)}\|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}^2\mathbf{u}_\lambda^m\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} + \|b^n - b^m\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)}\|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}\mathbf{u}_\lambda^m\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(T)}$$
$$\preceq (n\wedge m)^{\frac{2d}{p}-1} + \|b^n - b^m\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)}.$$

By (2.12) and (3.4) with $\alpha = \frac{4d}{3(2d+1)}$ and $\beta = \frac{4d}{2d+1}$, we have

$$\|\mathbf{w}_t^{n,m}\|_\infty \preceq \|\mathbf{w}_t^{n,m}\|_{\alpha,\beta;p} \preceq \|g_\lambda^{n,m}\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} + \|b^n - b^m\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)}$$
$$\preceq (n\wedge m)^{\frac{2d}{p}-1} + \|b^n - b^m\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)},$$

and by (2.11), (2.12), (3.4) with $\alpha = \frac{4d+1}{3(2d+1)}$ and $\beta = \frac{4d+1}{2d+1}$,

$$\|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}\mathbf{w}_t^{n,m}\|_\infty \preceq \|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}\mathbf{w}_t^{n,m}\|_{\alpha(\beta-1)/\beta,\beta-1;p} \preceq \|\mathbf{w}_t^{n,m}\|_{\alpha,\beta;p}$$
$$\preceq (n\wedge m)^{\frac{2d}{p}-1} + \|b^n - b^m\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)}.$$

The proof is complete. □

For $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, let

$$H^n_t(x, \mathrm{v}) := \mathrm{v} + \mathbf{u}^n_{\lambda,t}(x, \mathrm{v}). \tag{5.5}$$

By (5.4), one can choose λ large enough (being independent of n and fixed below) so that

$$\|\nabla_{\mathrm{v}} \mathbf{u}^n_\lambda\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(T)} \leqslant \tfrac{1}{2}, \tag{5.6}$$

and thus,

$$\tfrac{1}{2}|\mathrm{v} - \mathrm{v}'| \leqslant |H^n_t(x, \mathrm{v}) - H^n_t(x, \mathrm{v}')| \leqslant \tfrac{3}{2}|\mathrm{v} - \mathrm{v}'|. \tag{5.7}$$

Observing that

$$\partial_t H^n + \mathscr{L}^{a^n, b^n}_t H^n - \lambda \mathbf{u}^n_\lambda = 0,$$

by Itô's formula, we have

$$H^n_t(Z^n_t) = H^n_0(Z^n_0) + \lambda \int_0^t \mathbf{u}^n_{\lambda,s}(Z^n_s)\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t \Theta^n_s(Z^n_s)\mathrm{d}W_s, \tag{5.8}$$

where $\Theta^n_s(z) := (\nabla_{\mathrm{v}} H^n_s \cdot \sigma^n_s)(z)$ satisfies by (5.6) and (5.3) that

$$\|\Theta^n\|_\infty \leqslant 2\|\sigma\|_\infty,$$

and for the given $p > 2(2d+1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla\Theta^n\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T_0)} &\leqslant 2\|\nabla\sigma^n\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T_0)} + \|\sigma^n\|_\infty \|\nabla\nabla_{\mathrm{v}} H^n\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T_0)} \\ &\leqslant 2\|\nabla\sigma\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T_0)} + C\|\sigma\|_\infty \|b\|_{\mathbb{H}^{2/3,0}_p(T_0)}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, since $b^n \in L^p([0,T]; C^\infty_b(\mathbb{R}^{2d}))$ and $\sigma^n \in L^\infty([0,T]; C^\infty_b(\mathbb{R}^{2d}))$, the following SDE admits a unique solution $Z^n_t = (X^n_t, \dot{X}^n_t)$

$$\mathrm{d}Z^n_t = (\dot{X}^n_t, b^n_t(Z^n_t))\mathrm{d}t + (0, \sigma^n_t(Z^n_t)\mathrm{d}W_t), \quad Z^n_0 = z = (x, \mathrm{v}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}. \tag{5.10}$$

We have

Lemma 5.3. *Under* **(UE)** *and* (5.1)*, for any $q \geqslant 2$, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\left\| \sup_{t\in[0,T_0]} |Z^n_t - Z^m_t| \right\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leqslant C\left(\|b^n - b^m\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T_0)} + (n \wedge m)^{\frac{2d}{p}-1} \right). \tag{5.11}$$

Proof. By (5.8) and Itô's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |H^n_t(Z^n_t) - H^m_t(Z^m_t)|^2 &= |H^n_0(z) - H^m_0(z)|^2 + \int_0^t \|\Theta^n_s(Z^n_s) - \Theta^m_s(Z^m_s)\|^2 \mathrm{d}s \\ &\quad + 2\lambda \int_0^t \langle H^n_s(Z^n_s) - H^m_s(Z^m_s), \mathbf{u}^n_{\lambda,s}(Z^n_s) - \mathbf{u}^m_{\lambda,s}(Z^m_s)\rangle \mathrm{d}s \\ &\quad + 2\int_0^t \langle H^n_s(Z^n_s) - H^m_s(Z^m_s), (\Theta^n_s(Z^n_s) - \Theta^m_s(Z^m_s))\mathrm{d}W_s\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

and also,

$$|X^n_t - X^m_t|^2 = 2\int_0^t \langle X^n_s - X^m_s, \dot{X}^n_s - \dot{X}^m_s\rangle \mathrm{d}s.$$

If we set

$$\xi_t := |H_t^n(Z_t^n) - H_t^n(Z_t^m)|^2 + |X_t^n - X_t^m|^2,$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_t &\leqslant 2\|H_t^n - H_t^m\|_\infty^2 + 2|H_t^n(Z_t^n) - H_t^m(Z_t^m)|^2 + |X_t^n - X_t^m|^2\\ &\leqslant \xi_0 + \int_0^t \zeta_s^{(1)}\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t \zeta_s^{(2)}\mathrm{d}W_s + \int_0^t \xi_s\beta_s\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t \xi_s\alpha_s\mathrm{d}W_s,\end{aligned}$$

where $\xi_0 := 3\|\mathbf{u}^n - \mathbf{u}^m\|^2_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(T_0)}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_s^{(1)} &:= 4\|\Theta_s^n(Z_s^m) - \Theta_s^m(Z_s^m)\|^2 + 6\lambda|H_s^n(Z_s^m) - H_s^m(Z_s^m)|^2,\\ \zeta_s^{(2)} &:= 4(\Theta_s^n(Z_s^n) - \Theta_s^m(Z_s^m))^*(H_s^n(Z_s^n) - H_s^m(Z_s^m))\\ &\quad - 4(\Theta_s^n(Z_s^n) - \Theta_s^n(Z_s^m))^*(H_s^n(Z_s^n) - H_s^n(Z_s^m)),\\ \beta_s &:= 4\|\Theta_s^n(Z_s^n) - \Theta_s^n(Z_s^m)\|^2/\xi_s + 6\lambda + \lambda|\dot{X}_s^n - \dot{X}_s^m|^2/\xi_s\\ &\quad + 2\langle X_s^n - X_s^m, \dot{X}_s^n - \dot{X}_s^m\rangle/\xi_s,\\ \alpha_s &:= 4(\Theta_s^n(Z_s^n) - \Theta_s^n(Z_s^m))^*(H_s^n(Z_s^n) - H_s^n(Z_s^m))/\xi_s.\end{aligned}$$

By (5.7), one has

$$\xi_t \asymp |Z_t^n - Z_t^m|^2 = |X_t^n - X_t^m|^2 + |\dot{X}_t^n - \dot{X}_t^m|^2, \tag{5.12}$$

which implies by (6.6) that

$$|\beta_s| + |\alpha_s|^2 \leq 1 + (\mathcal{M}|\nabla\Theta_s^n|(Z_s^n))^2 + (\mathcal{M}|\nabla\Theta_s^n|(Z_s^m))^2 =: G_s^{n,m}. \tag{5.13}$$

In view of $p > 2(2d+1)$ and $\sup_n \|\mathcal{M}|\nabla\Theta^n|\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} < \infty$, by (ii) of Corollary 4.4, we have for any $\gamma > 0$,

$$\sup_{n,m} \mathbb{E}\exp\left\{\gamma\int_0^T G_s^{n,m}\mathrm{d}s\right\} < \infty.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 6.1 below with $q_0 = q$, $q_1 = q_2 = q_3 = 3q/2$, we have

$$\|\xi_T^*\|_q \leq \|\mathbf{u}^n - \mathbf{u}^m\|^2_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(T)} + \left\|\int_0^T |\zeta_s^{(1)}|\mathrm{d}s\right\|_{3q/2} + \left\|\int_0^T |\zeta_s^{(2)}|^2\mathrm{d}s\right\|^{1/2}_{3q/4}, \tag{5.14}$$

where $\xi_T^* := \sup_{t\in[0,T]}\xi_t$.

Now, letting

$$\ell_{n,m} := \|\sigma^n - \sigma^m\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(T)} + \|\mathbf{u}^n - \mathbf{u}^m\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(T)} + \|\nabla\mathbf{u}^n - \nabla\mathbf{u}^m\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(T)},$$

by definitions, we have

$$|\zeta_s^{(1)}| \leq \ell_{n,m}^2,$$

and by (6.6) and (5.12),

$$\begin{aligned}|\zeta_s^{(2)}|^2 &\leq |(\Theta_s^n(Z_s^n) - \Theta_s^m(Z_s^m))^*(H_s^n(Z_s^m) - H_s^m(Z_s^m))|^2\\ &\quad + |(\Theta_s^n(Z_s^m) - \Theta_s^m(Z_s^m))^*(H_s^n(Z_s^n) - H_s^n(Z_s^m))|^2\\ &\leq \left(\|\Theta_s^n(Z_s^m) - \Theta_s^m(Z_s^m)\|^2 + \|\Theta_s^n(Z_s^n) - \Theta_s^n(Z_s^m)\|^2\right)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\times |\mathbf{u}^n_s(Z^m_s) - \mathbf{u}^m_s(Z^m_s)|^2 + \|\Theta^n_s(Z^m_s) - \Theta^m_s(Z^m_s)\|^2 \xi_s \\
&\leq \ell^4_{n,m} + \ell^2_{n,m} G^{n,m}_s \xi_s,
\end{aligned}$$

where $G^{n,m}_s$ is defined by (5.13). Substituting these estimates into (5.14) and by Hölder's inequlity and Young's inequality, we have for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\xi^*_T\|_q &\leq \ell^2_{n,m} + \ell_{n,m} \left\| \int_0^T G^{n,m}_s \xi_s \mathrm{d}s \right\|^{1/2}_{3q/4} \\
&\leq \ell^2_{n,m} + \ell_{n,m} \left\| \xi^*_T \int_0^T G^{n,m}_s \mathrm{d}s \right\|^{1/2}_{3q/4} \\
&\leq \ell^2_{n,m} + \ell_{n,m} \left\| \int_0^T G^{n,m}_s \mathrm{d}s \right\|^{1/2}_{3q} \|\xi^*_T\|^{\frac{1}{2}}_q \\
&\leq C_\varepsilon \ell^2_{n,m} + \varepsilon \|\xi^*_T\|_q. \qquad (5.15)
\end{aligned}$$

Letting ε be small enough and noticing that by Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2,

$$\ell_{n,m} \leqslant C \left(\|b^n - b^m\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} + (n \wedge m)^{\frac{2d}{p}-1} \right),$$

we obtain the desired estimate (5.11) from (5.15). □

Theorem 5.4. *(Existence of strong solutions) Under* **(UE)** *and* (5.1)*, for any $q \geqslant 2$, there is a continuous $\mathscr{F}_t$-adapted process $Z_t = (X_t, \dot{X}_t)$ solving equation* (1.1)*, and such that*

$$\left\| \sup_{t\in[0,T]} |Z^n_t - Z_t| \right\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leqslant C \left(\|b^n - b\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} + n^{\frac{2d}{p}-1} \right). \qquad (5.16)$$

Proof. First of all, by (5.11), there exists a continuous $\mathscr{F}_t$-adapted process $Z^\infty_t := Z_t = (X_t, \dot{X}_t)$ satisfying (5.16). Moreover, for any $p > 2d+1$, there is a positive constant $C = C(T, K, \kappa_0, d, p)$ such that for any $f \in \mathbb{L}^p(T)$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^T f_s(Z^\infty_s) \mathrm{d}s \right) \leqslant C \|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)}. \qquad (5.17)$$

In fact, for any $f \in C_c([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d})$, by (4.3) we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^T f_s(Z^n_s) \mathrm{d}s \right) \leqslant C \|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)}, \qquad (5.18)$$

which gives (5.17) by taking limit $n \to \infty$ and a monotone class argument.

Below we show that Z_t solves SDE (1.1) by taking limits for (5.10). For this, we only need to show the following two limits:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t b^n_s(Z^n_s) \mathrm{d}s - \int_0^t b_s(Z_s) \mathrm{d}s \right| = 0, \qquad (5.19)$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t \sigma^n_s(Z^n_s) \mathrm{d}W_s - \int_0^t \sigma_s(Z_s) \mathrm{d}W_s \right| = 0. \qquad (5.20)$$

For (5.19), by (5.17) and (5.18) we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{m\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{\infty\}}\mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^t|b_s^n(Z_s^m)-b_s(Z_s^m)|\mathrm{d}s\right)\leqslant C\lim_{n\to\infty}\|b^n-b\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(t)}=0,$$

and for each $n\in\mathbb{N}$, by the dominated convergence theorem,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^t|b_s^n(Z_s^m)-b_s^n(Z_s^\infty)|\mathrm{d}s\right)=0.$$

Limit (5.20) is similar. The proof is complete. □

Now, by a result of Cherny [9], the existence of strong solutions together with the weak uniqueness (see Theorem 4.5) implies the pathwise uniqueness. However, to show the homeomorphism property of $z\mapsto Z_t(z)$, one needs the following q-order moment estimate for all $q\in\mathbb{R}$, which clearly implies the pathwise uniqueness.

Lemma 5.5. *For any $q\in\mathbb{R}$, there is a constant $C>0$ such that for any two solutions Z_t and Z'_t of SDE* (1.1) *with starting points $z=(x,\mathrm{v})$ and $z'=(x',\mathrm{v}')$ respectively,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|Z_t-Z'_t|^{2q}\right)\leqslant C|z-z'|^{2q}. \tag{5.21}$$

Moreover, we also have

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{t\in[0,T]}(1+|Z_t|^2)^q\right)\leqslant C(1+|z|^2)^q. \tag{5.22}$$

Proof. Let $H=H^\infty$ be defined by (5.5). By (5.10) and Itô's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|H_t(Z_t)-H_t(Z'_t)|^2=|H_0(Z_0)-H_0(Z'_0)|^2&+\int_0^t\|\Theta_s(Z_s)-\Theta_s(Z'_s)\|^2\mathrm{d}s\\&+2\lambda\int_0^t\langle H_s(Z_s)-H_s(Z'_s),\mathbf{u}_{\lambda,s}(Z_s)-\mathbf{u}_{\lambda,s}(Z'_s)\rangle\mathrm{d}s\\&+2\int_0^t\langle H_s(Z_s)-H_s(Z'_s),(\Theta_s(Z_s)-\Theta_s(Z'_s))\mathrm{d}W_s\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of Lemma 5.3, if we set

$$\xi_t:=|H_t(Z_t)-H_t(Z'_t)|^2+|X_t-X'_t|^2,$$

then

$$\xi_t=\xi_0+\int_0^t\xi_s\beta_s\mathrm{d}s+\int_0^t\xi_s\alpha_s\mathrm{d}W_s,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_s:=[\|\Theta_s(Z_s)-\Theta_s(Z'_s)\|^2&+2\langle X_s-X'_s,\dot{X}_s-\dot{X}'_s\rangle]/\xi_s\\&+2\lambda\langle H_s(Z_s)-H_s(Z'_s),\mathbf{u}_{\lambda,s}(Z_s)-\mathbf{u}_{\lambda,s}(Z'_s)\rangle/\xi_s\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\alpha_s := 2(\Theta_s(Z_s) - \Theta_s(Z'_s))^*(H_s(Z_s) - H_s(Z'_s))/\xi_s.$$

By Dolèans-Dade's exponential formula, we have

$$\xi_t = \xi_0 \exp\left\{\int_0^t \alpha_s \mathrm{d}W_s + \int_0^t \left[\beta_s - \tfrac{1}{2}|\alpha_s|^2\right]\mathrm{d}s\right\} \tag{5.23}$$

By (5.7), one has

$$\xi_t \asymp |Z_t - Z'_t|^2 = |X_t - X'_t|^2 + |\dot{X}_t - \dot{X}'_t|^2.$$

Hence, by (5.5) and (6.6) below,

$$|\beta(s)| + |\alpha(s)|^2 \le 1 + (\mathcal{M}|\nabla\Theta_s|(Z_s))^2 + (\mathcal{M}|\nabla\Theta_s|(Z'_s))^2.$$

Since $\|\mathcal{M}|\nabla\Theta|\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(T)} < \infty$ and $p > 2(2d+1)$, by Corollary 4.4, we have for any $\gamma > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\exp\left\{\gamma\int_0^T (|\beta_s| + |\alpha_s|^2)\mathrm{d}s\right\} < \infty. \tag{5.24}$$

For $q \in \mathbb{R}$, let

$$\mathscr{E}_t^q := \exp\left\{q\int_0^t \alpha_s \mathrm{d}W_s - \tfrac{q^2}{2}\int_0^t |\alpha_s|^2\mathrm{d}s\right\}.$$

By (5.24) and Novikov's criterion, $t \mapsto \mathscr{E}_t^q$ is a continuous martingale. Therefore, by (5.23), Hölder's inequality and Doob's maximal inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|Z_t - Z'_t|^{2q}\right)\\
&\le |z-z'|^{2q}\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\exp\left\{q\int_0^t \alpha_s \mathrm{d}W_s + q\int_0^t [\beta_s - \tfrac{1}{2}|\alpha_s|^2]\mathrm{d}s\right\}\right)\\
&\le |z-z'|^{2q}\left(\mathbb{E}\left((\mathscr{E}^q)_T^*\right)^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\mathbb{E}\exp\left\{\int_0^T ((q^2+q)|\alpha_s|^2 + q\beta_s)\mathrm{d}s\right\}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\le |z-z'|^{2q}\left(\mathbb{E}(\mathscr{E}_T^q)^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le |z-z'|^{2q},
\end{aligned}$$

which gives (5.21).

On the other hand, if we let

$$\xi_t := 1 + |H_t(Z_t)|^2 + |X_t|^2,$$

then for any $q \in \mathbb{R}$, by Itô's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi_t^q &= \xi_0^q + q\int_0^t \xi_s^{q-1}(2\langle X_s, \dot{X}_s\rangle + \|\Theta_s(Z_s)\|^2 - \lambda\langle H_s(Z_s), \mathbf{u}_{\lambda,s}(Z_s)\rangle)\mathrm{d}s\\
&\quad + 2q\int_0^t \xi_s^{q-1}\langle H_s(Z_s), \Theta_s(Z_s)\mathrm{d}W_s\rangle + 2q(q-1)\int_0^t \xi_s^{q-2}|\Theta_s^*(Z_s)H_s(Z_s)|^2\mathrm{d}s.
\end{aligned}$$

Noticing that

$$|H_t(Z_t)| \asymp 1 + |\dot{X}_t|, \;\; \xi_t \asymp 1 + |Z_t|^2 = 1 + |X_t|^2 + |\dot{X}_t|^2,$$

by Burkholder's inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{s\in[0,t]} \xi_t^{2q}\right) \preceq \xi_0^{2q} + \mathbb{E}\int_0^t \xi_s^{2q} \mathrm{d}s,$$

which in turn gives (5.22) by Gronwall's inequality. □

Now we can give

Proof of Theorem 1.1. The existence and uniqueness of a strong solution in time interval $[0, T]$ follows by Theorem 5.4 and Lemma 5.5. The bi-continuous version of $(t, z) \mapsto Z_t(z)$ follows by (5.21) and Kolmogorov's continuity criterion.

(A) As for the homeomorphism property, it follows by Lemma 5.5 and Kunita's argument (see [22, 39]).

(B) The weak differentiability of $z \mapsto Z_t(z)$ and estimate (1.4) follow by (5.21) and [37, Theorem 1.1].

(C) It follows by (5.16). □

6. Appendix

The following stochastic Gronwall's type lemma is probably well-known. Since we can not find it in the literature, a proof is provided here for the reader's convenience.

Lemma 6.1. *For given $T > 0$, let $(\xi_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ and $(\beta_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ (resp. $(\alpha_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$) be two real-valued (resp. $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued) measurable $\mathscr{F}_t$-adapted processes. Let ζ_t be an Itô process with the form:*

$$\zeta_t = \zeta_0 + \int_0^t \zeta_s^{(1)} \mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t \zeta_s^{(2)} \mathrm{d}W_s.$$

Suppose that for any $\gamma > 0$,

$$\kappa_\gamma := \mathbb{E}\exp\left\{\gamma \int_0^T (|\beta_s| + |\alpha_s|^2)\mathrm{d}s\right\} < \infty, \tag{6.1}$$

and

$$0 \leqslant \xi_t \leqslant \zeta_t + \int_0^t \xi_s\beta_s \mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t \xi_s\alpha_s \mathrm{d}W_s. \tag{6.2}$$

Then for any $q_0 \in [1, \infty)$ and $q_1, q_2, q_3 > q_0$, there is a constant $C > 0$ only depending on $q_i, \kappa_\gamma, i = 0, 1, 2, 3$ such that

$$\|\xi_T^*\|_{q_0} \leqslant C\left(\|\zeta_0\|_{q_1} + \left\|\int_0^T |\zeta_s^{(1)}|\mathrm{d}s\right\|_{q_2} + \left\|\int_0^T |\zeta_s^{(2)}|^2 \mathrm{d}s\right\|_{q_3/2}^{1/2}\right), \tag{6.3}$$

where $\xi_T^* := \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \xi_t$ and $\|\cdot\|_{q_i}$ denotes the norm in $L^{q_i}(\Omega)$.

Proof. Write

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_t &:= \zeta_t + \int_0^t \xi_s\beta_s \mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t \xi_s\alpha_s \mathrm{d}W_s \\ &= \zeta_t + \int_0^t \eta_s\bar{\beta}_s \mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t \eta_s\bar{\alpha}_s \mathrm{d}W_s,\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\beta}_s := \xi_s\beta_s/\eta_s$ and $\bar{\alpha}_s := \xi_s\alpha_s/\eta_s$. Here we use the convention $\frac{0}{0} := 0$.

Define

$$M_t := \exp\left\{\int_0^t \bar{\alpha}_s \mathrm{d}W_s + \int_0^t (\bar{\beta}_s - \tfrac{1}{2}|\bar{\alpha}_s|^2)\mathrm{d}s\right\}.$$

By Itô's formula, we have

$$M_t = 1 + \int_0^t M_s\bar{\beta}_s \mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t M_s\bar{\alpha}_s \mathrm{d}W_s$$

and

$$\eta_t = M_t\left[\zeta_0 + \int_0^t M_s^{-1}(\zeta_s^{(1)} - \langle\bar{\alpha}_s, \zeta_s^{(2)}\rangle)\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t M_s^{-1}\zeta_s^{(2)}\mathrm{d}W_s\right].$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\eta_T^*\|_{q_0} &\leqslant \|M_T^*\zeta_0\|_{q_0} + \left\|M_T^*(M^{-1})_T^* \int_0^T |\zeta_s^{(1)}|\mathrm{d}s\right\|_{q_0} \\ &\quad + \left\|M_T^*(M^{-1})_T^* \int_0^T |\bar{\alpha}_s| \cdot |\zeta_s^{(2)}|\mathrm{d}s\right\|_{q_0} \\ &\quad + \left\|M_T^* \sup_{t\in[0,T]}\left|\int_0^t M_s^{-1}\zeta_s^{(2)}\mathrm{d}W_s\right|\right\|_{q_0} \\ &=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4.\end{aligned}$$

Noticing that by (6.2),

$$|\bar{\beta}_s| \leqslant |\beta_s|, \quad |\bar{\alpha}_s| \leqslant |\alpha_s|, \tag{6.4}$$

for any $p \in \mathbb{R}$, by (6.1), Hölder's inequality and Doob's maximal inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} M_t^p\right) < \infty. \tag{6.5}$$

Thus, by Hölder's inequality and (6.5), we have

$$I_1 \leqslant C\|\zeta_0\|_{q_1}, \quad I_2 \leqslant C\left\|\int_0^T |\zeta_s^{(1)}|\mathrm{d}s\right\|_{q_2},$$

and by (6.4),

$$I_3 \leqslant \left\|M_T^*(M^{-1})_T^*\left(\int_0^T |\alpha_s|^2\mathrm{d}s\right)^{1/2}\left(\int_0^T |\zeta_s^{(2)}|^2\mathrm{d}s\right)^{1/2}\right\|_{q_0}$$

$$\leqslant C\left\|\left(\int_0^T|\zeta_s^{(2)}|^2\mathrm{d}s\right)^{1/2}\right\|_{q_3}=C\left\|\int_0^T|\zeta_s^{(2)}|^2\mathrm{d}s\right\|_{q_3/2}^{1/2}.$$

Similarly, by Hölder and Burkholder's inequalities, we also have

$$I_4\leqslant C\left\|\int_0^T|\zeta_s^{(2)}|^2\mathrm{d}s\right\|_{q_3/2}^{1/2}.$$

Combining the above estimates, we obtain (6.3). □

Let f be a locally integrable function on $\mathbb{R}^d$. The Hardy-Littlewood maximal function is defined by

$$\mathcal{M}f(x):=\sup_{0<r<\infty}\frac{1}{|B_r|}\int_{B_r}f(x+y)\mathrm{d}y,$$

where $B_r:=\{x\in\mathbb{R}^d:|x|<r\}$. The following result can be found in [10, Appendix A].

Lemma 6.2. *(i) There exists a constant $C_d>0$ such that for all $f\in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$|f(x)-f(y)|\leqslant C_d|x-y|(\mathcal{M}|\nabla f|(x)+\mathcal{M}|\nabla f|(y)). \tag{6.6}$$

(ii) For any $p>1$, there exists a constant $C_{d,p}$ such that for all $f\in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\|\mathcal{M}f\|_p\leqslant C_{d,p}\|f\|_p. \tag{6.7}$$

References

[1] Bass R. and Chen Z.-Q.: Brownian motion with singular drift. *Annals of Probability*, Vol. 31, No. 2, 791-817(2003).

[2] Bergh J. and Löfström J.: *Interpolation spaces, an introduction*. Springer-Verlag, 1976.

[3] Bogachev V.I., Krylov N.V. and Röckner M.: On regularity of transition probabilities and invariant measures of singular diffusions under minimal conditions. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, **26**:11-12, 2037-2080 (2001).

[4] Bogachev V.I., Krylov N.V. and Röckner M.: Elliptic and parabolic equations for measures. *Russian Math. Surveys*, **64**: 6, 973-1078 (2009).

[5] Bouchut F.: Hypoeliptic regularity in kinetic equations. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **81**, 1135-1159 (2002).

[6] Bramanti M., Cupini G., Lanconelli E., Priola E.: Global L^p-estimate for degenerate Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operators. *Math Z.*, **266**, 789-816 (2010).

[7] Chaudru de Raynal P. E.: Strong existence and uniqueness for stochastic differential equation with Hölder drift and degenerate noise. http://arxiv.org/abs/1205.6688.

[8] Chen Z.Q. and Zhang X.: L^p-maximal hypoelliptic regularity of nonlocal kinetic Fokker-Planck operators. arXiv:1608.05502.

[9] Cherny A.S.: On the uniqueness in law and the pathwise uniqueness for stochastic differential equations. *Theory of Probab. and its Applications*, 46, No.3, 483-497.

[10] Crippa G. and De Lellis C.: Estimates and regularity results for the DiPerna- Lions flow. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, **616** (2008), 15-46.

[11] Fedrizzi E., Flandoli F.: Noise prevents singularities in linear transport equations. *J. of Funct. Anal.*, **264**, 1329-1354 (2013).
[12] Fedrizzi E., Flandoli F.: Hölder flow and differentiability for SDEs with non regular drift. *Stoch. Anal. and Appl.*, **31**, 708-736 (2013).
[13] Fedrizzi E., Flandoli F., Priola E. and Vovelle J.: Regularity of Stochastic Kinetic Equations. http://arxiv.org/pdf/1606.01088v2.pdf.
[14] Figalli A.: Existence and uniqueness of martingale solutions for SDEs with rough or degenerate coefficients. *J. Funct. Anal.*, **254** no. 1, 109-153 (2008).
[15] Flandoli F., Gubinelli M., Priola E.: Well-posedness of the transport equation by stochastic perturbation. *Invent. Math.* **180** (1), 1-53 (2010).
[16] Ikeda N., Watanabe, S.: *Stochastic differential equations and diffusion processes*, 2nd ed., North-Holland/Kodanska, Amsterdam/Tokyo, 1989.
[17] Jin P.: Brownian motion with singular time-dependent drift. to appear in *J. Theoretic Probab.*
[18] Karatza I., Shreve S.E.: Brownian motion and Stochastic Calculus. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988.
[19] Krylov N.V.: *Controlled diffusion processes*. Translated from the Russian by A.B. Aries. Applications of Mathematics, 14. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1980.
[20] Krylov N.V.: *Lectures on elliptic and parabolic equations in Sobolev spaces*. Graduate Studies in Math., Vol. **96**, AMS, 2008.
[21] Krylov N.V. and Röckner M.: Strong solutions of stochastic equations with singular time dependent drift. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, **131**, 154-196 (2005).
[22] Kunita, H.: *Stochastic flows and stochastic differential equations*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics 24, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.
[23] Menozzi S.: Martingale problems for some degenerate Kolmogorov equations. arXiv:1404.0461.
[24] Menoukeu-Pamen O, Meyer-Brandis T., Nilssen T., Proske F. and Zhang T.: A variational approach to the construction and Malliavin differentiability of strong solutions of SDE's. *Math. Ann.*, **357**(2):761–799 (2013).
[25] Mohammed S.E.A., Nilssen T. and Proske F.: Sobolev differentiable stochastic flows for SDEs with singular coefficients: applications to the transport equation. *Ann. Probab.*, **43**(3):1535–1576 (2015).
[26] Portenko N.I.: *Generalized diffusion processes*. Nauka, Moscow, 1982 In Russian; English translation: Amer. Math. Soc. Provdince, Rhode Island, 1990.
[27] Priola E.: On weak uniqueness for some degenerate SDEs by global L^p-estimate. *Potential Anal.*, **42**:247-281 (2015).
[28] Röckner, M. and Zhang, X.: Weak uniqueness of Fokker-Planck equations with degenerate and bounded coefficients. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* **348**, no. 7-8, 435-438 (2010).
[29] Soize C.: *The Fokker-Planck Equation for Stochastic Dynamical Systems and Its Explicit Steady State Solutions.* Ser. Adv. Math. Appl. Sci., vol. 17, World Scientific, Singapore, 1994.
[30] Stein E.M.: *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1970.
[31] Stroock D. and Varadhan S.R.S.: *Multidimensional diffusion processes*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997.
[32] Talay D.: Stochastic Hamiltonian systems: Exponential convergence to the invariant measure and discretization by the implicit Euler scheme. *Markov Process. Related Fields*, **8**, 1-36 (2002).

[33] Trevisan D.: Well-posedness of multidimensional diffusion processes with weakly differentiable coefficients. *Elect. Jour. of Prob.*, Vol. **21** (2016).
[34] Triebel H.: *Theory of functions spaces*. Birkhäuser-Verlag. 1983.
[35] Veretennikov, A. Ju.: On the strong solutions of stochastic differential equations. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, **24**, 354-366 (1979).
[36] Wang F. and Zhang X.: Degenerate SDE with Hölder-Dini drift and non-Lipschitz noise coefficient. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* Vol. **48**, No. 3, pp. 2189-2222(2016).
[37] Xie L. and Zhang X.: Sobolev differentiable flows of SDEs with local Sobolev and super-linear growth coefficients. *Annals of Probab.*, Vol. **44**, Number 6, 3661-3687(2016).
[38] Zhang X.: Strong solutions of SDEs with singular drift and Sobolev diffusion coefficients. *Stoch. Proc. and Appl.*, **115**, 1805-1818(2005).
[39] Zhang X.: Stochastic homeomorphism flows of SDEs with singular drifts and Sobolev diffusion coefficients. *Elect. Jour. of Prob.*, Vol. **16**, no. 38,1096-1116 (2011).
[40] Zhang X.: Stochastic partial differential equations with unbounded and degenerate coefficients. *J. Differential Equations*, **250** 1924-1966 (2011).
[41] Zhang X.: Stochastic differential equations with Sobolev diffusion and singular drift. *Annals of Applied Probability*, Vol. **26**, No. 5, 2697-2732(2016).
[42] Zvonkin A.K.: A transformation of the phase space of a diffusion process that removes the drift. *Mat. Sbornik*, **93(135)**, No.1, 129-149 (1974).

School of Mathematics and Statistics, Wuhan University, Wuhan, Hubei 430072, P.R.China, Email: XichengZhang@gmail.com